SEPTEMBER, 1936

THE COMMUNIST

Review of the Month — A. B.

Fighting for Democracy in Spain — C. A. HATHAWAY

A. F. of L. Unity Is Threatened — LOUIS F. BUDENZ

Towards Youth Unity — GIL GREEN

The Inter-American Peace Conference — HARRISON GEORGE

The Housing Question — E. C. GREENFIELD

ELECTION CAMPAIGN OUTLINE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW PAMPHLETS
On Current Questions

•

SPAIN DEFENDS DEMOCRACY, *by Harry Gannes and G. Marion* .05
THE UNITED STRUGGLE FOR PEACE, *by Georgi Dimitroff* .03
THE BLACK LEGION RIDES, *by George Morris* .05
HOW TO WIN SOCIAL JUSTICE—Can Coughlin and Lemke Do It? *by Alex Bittelman* .05
UNIONIZING STEEL, *by William Z. Foster* .05
THE NEW SOVIET CONSTITUTION .02
ACCEPTANCE SPEECHES OF EARL BROWDER AND JAMES W. FORD .01
WHO ARE THE AMERICANS? *by Earl Browder* .01
DEMOCRACY OR FASCISM, *by Earl Browder* (Report to the Ninth Convention of the Communist Party) .05
THE COMMUNIST ELECTION PLATFORM—Also in Italian and Spanish .01

•

Soon to Appear

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE LIBERTY LEAGUE, *by Grace Hutchins* .02
NIGHT RIDERS IN SUNNY FLORIDA, *by Jack Jameson* .03
BIOGRAPHIES OF EARL BROWDER AND JAMES W. FORD each .02
INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM, *by William Z. Foster.* A new reprint with an introduction by Harry Raymond .05

•

Order from your bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE
COMMUNIST
A Magazine of the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Vol. XV. SEPTEMBER, 1936 No. 9

CONTENTS

REVIEW OF THE MONTH 803
By A. B.

ELECTION CAMPAIGN OUTLINE FOR 1936 819

FIGHTING FOR DEMOCRACY IN SPAIN 829
By CLARENCE A. HATHAWAY

A. F. OF L. UNITY IS THREATENED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL 845
By LOUIS F. BUDENZ

TOWARDS YOUTH UNITY 855
By GIL GREEN

ON THE INTER-AMERICAN PEACE CONFERENCE 865
By HARRISON GEORGE

THE HOUSING QUESTION 873
By E. C. GREENFIELD

BRITISH RULE IN SOUTH AFRICA 885
By WILLIAM L. PATTERSON

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Make all checks, money orders, and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, P.O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates $2 a year; $1 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20c.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Four Articles on the United States

Four Articles on Spain

in the SEPTEMBER ISSUE *of*

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

28 ARTICLES — 144 PAGES

•

Feature Articles:

1. *Earl Browder:* THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY—THE PEOPLE'S FRONT IN THE U.S.A.
2. *Harry Owen:* THE DRAFT CONSTITUTION OF THE U.S.S.R. AND THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION.
3. *Dolores Ibarruri (La Pasionaria):* AGAINST THE ENEMIES OF THE PEOPLE.
4. THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE FASCISTS AND THE COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARIES IN SPAIN.
5. THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE FASCIST PUTSCH.
6. THE U.S.A. BEFORE THE ELECTIONS.
7. THE NINTH CONVENTION OF THE C.P.U.S.A
8. ON THE EVE OF THE FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE C.P. OF SPAIN.

20 other articles on France, England, U.S.S.R., Germany, Canada, Austria, Belgium, Sweden and Poland

PRICE REMAINS UNCHANGED
15 CENTS A COPY

•

Distribute 25,000 Copies of the September Issue!

BUILD A MASS CIRCULATION FOR
THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL!

•

Order from your bookshop or from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Sta. D New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Review of the Month

Roosevelt's Chautauqua Address—Intentions and Foreign Policy—Neutrality Failed, Long Live Neutrality—What Kind of Political Commitments?—A Peace Policy in the Far East—Cuba Is the Acid Test—Are We Really Good Neighbors?—Conditions for Success of Inter-American Peace Conference—Abandon Monroe Doctrine and No Rivalry to League of Nations—Conciliation of Hearst and Wall Street Will Wreck Conference—The American Government and Spain—Impartiality That Works for Fascists—American People Are Against Reaction—Democracy and Peace Are Issues in Spain—Support Spanish People—Spain and the Socialist Call—Trial of Trotskyist Assassins—Trotskyism Exposed as Fascist Terrorism—The Coughlin Convention—Minnesota and Wisconsin Appeal for National Farmer-Labor Alignment—Labor's Non-Partisan League Should Respond—The Congressional Elections of 1936.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S Chautauqua address on International Affairs was evidently not very agreeable to the German Nazis, to Hearst and to the Republican Party. It could hardly please the ears of either the fascist-military clique of Japan or of Mussolini.

The peaceful *intentions* underlying Roosevelt's address and its opposition to the war-making designs of the fascist aggressors, the *sentiments* of opposition, could not be mistaken. The expression of such intentions and sentiments by the President of the United States at this time is in itself a deed of importance. Yet the decisive question has still got to be answered: to what extent does the foreign policy of the Roosevelt administration give adequate expression to these peaceful intentions and sentiments?

It was very good for President Roosevelt to have said:

". . . that the conscience of America revolts against war and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> that any nation which provokes war forfeits the sympathy of the people of the United States."

It was good to let Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese military clique know that the people of the United States are opposed to these fascist aggressors. But is that enough really to check their war provocations?

At this very moment Hitler and Mussolini are threatening to provoke a world conflagration by their intervention in support of the fascist mutineers in Spain. Openly and brazenly these two fascist governments are helping to destroy democracy in Spain, are seeking to impose upon the Spanish people the rule of fascist agents of Hitler and Mussolini, are aiming to acquire strategic outposts in the Mediterranian for the new world war which they are preparing. This is taking place before the eyes of the whole world.

In the face of this situation, can the American people confine themselves merely to the expression of peaceful sentiments and intentions, or must they do something more about it?

President Roosevelt himself seems to have felt that merely to desire peace does not yet assure that peace will be maintained. He said:

> "We are not isolationists except in so far as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war. *Yet we must remember that so long as war exists on earth there will be some danger that even the nation which most ardently desires peace may be drawn into war.*" (Our emphasis.)

That is putting it very conservatively. As a matter of known fact all peoples of all nations ardently desire peace. Most of the nations today ardently desire peace. Yet the danger of a new world war has never been more acute or more immediate. And why? Because Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese fascist-military clique are seeking and provoking war; because in every capitalist country there are powerful reactionary and fascist cliques that seek to give aid and comfort to the fascist aggressors and war-makers. Our "own" Hearst, for example.

President Roosevelt knows that. He intimates that much in his own address. Yet he still hangs on to "neutrality" as the best foreign policy for the United States. He hangs on to the same "neutrality" which, regardless of intentions and sentiments, has already proven itself a policy that *encourages the aggressors* instead of discouraging them. This is what happened in the case of Italy and Ethiopia. Can there be any doubt about it?

It was this "neutrality" that contributed to the Mussolini vic-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tory in Ethiopia. And from this fact several others followed almost immediately. Hitler became emboldened to remilitarize the Rhineland and to destroy the Locarno Treaty. Japan went further ahead with the partition of China and scrapped the Washington Treaty. Now, strengthened by these advances, Hitler and Mussolini are defying the world with their intervention in Spain, threatening to have their own way in Spain or—a world war.

President Roosevelt in his Chautauqua address admits the failure of this country's efforts to cooperate with other powers in securing general disarmament and limitation of naval armaments. But he does not put his finger on the true source of this failure. With the result that, instead of concluding in favor of an effective policy of peace, Hearst, Coughlin, Landon & Co. are given a fresh talking point in favor of more intensive armaments by the United States in favor of demagogic isolation which in practice means giving aid and comfort to the fascist aggressors.

Why did our efforts to cooperate for general disarmament and naval limitations fail? First, because Hitler, Mussolini and Japan did not want it. Second, because the dominant group in the British government (Baldwin-Hoare), and the former government of France (Laval) were each flirting with and supporting the fascist aggressors; England with Hitler and Japan; France with Mussolini. And third because the Roosevelt administration followed a policy of so-called "neutrality".

Baldwin and Laval, and the reactionary groups for whom they speak, have a good deal to answer for this failure. But that does not relieve the Roosevelt administration and its "neutrality" policy from its share of responsibility. Had the Roosevelt administration adopted a true peace policy, based upon the principle of collective security as practiced by the Soviet Union, the peace forces of the world would have been immeasurably strengthened, the fascist aggressors isolated, and the process of general disarmament and naval limitation would have been on its way. As it is, Hitler, Mussolini and Japan are setting the pace for armament and for war.

And where has "neutrality" brought us to? Nearer to war. It has led us on the road which Hearst is traveling.

It seems to us hardly an improvement to hear President Roosevelt say that "no matter how well we are supported by neutrality legislation", peace will depend upon the "day-to-day decisions" of those "who direct our foreign policy". It is true, of course, that a Landon or Hearst in the White House could very easily have used the existing neutrality legislation to give direct and more effective support to the fascist aggressors everywhere. This they could have done be-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause the neutrality legislation lends itself to such uses. It is also true that, without this neutrality legislation, a Landon or Hearst in the White House could have had much easier sailing in giving direct support to Mussolini and Hitler. That's why the *New York Herald Tribune* would rather have no neutrality legislation at all. But the thing which this gentry is opposed to definitely and under all conditions is a *peace policy based upon collective security*. And rather than this, they will take Roosevelt's neutrality.

There is no escaping the fact that in the Far East this country is in imminent danger of being drawn into war. Here it is not a question any more of merely expressing alarm and indignation at the war-provoking actions of the Japanese fascist-military clique. It is a question of doing something now and immediately to prevent the disaster. What should it be?

Landon and Hearst are satisfied to let Roosevelt follow the "neutrality" policy in order to stave off the adoption of a peace policy based on collective security. At the same time Hearst is carrying on a most vicious campaign to drive the United States and England into collaboration with Hitler and Mussolini. The same is being done by Coughlin. Hearst and Coughlin are doing it in the name of "isolation" and on the basis of Roosevelt's own neutrality policy.

This should be an eye-opener to all those who still hang on to "neutrality" as a way to the maintenance of peace.

We repeat what we have said many times before: Roosevelt's intentions and sentiments are not Hearst's or Landon's. Roosevelt said in Chautauqua: "We believe in democracy; we believe in freedom; we believe in peace". Hearst, Landon and Coughlin believe in none of these things. Yet when Roosevelt, in the same address, says: "We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars" but does not add that we should favor political commitments to maintain peace and check the aggressors, he is giving in to Landon and Hearst. Equally, when Roosevelt says "we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations" but does not add that we should support all those measures of the League of Nations that tend to curb the aggressor and maintain peace, he is merely echoing Landon and Hearst.

Landon and Hearst are satisfied to let Roosevelt carry out the tremendous armament program to which this administration is committed because these spokesmen of reaction and fascism are not concerned with peace; they are preparing for war. But Roosevelt insists that he is concerned with peace. Certainly the American people are. This means to preserve peace in the Far East, in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pacific, and the curbing of Japanese aggression. By what means? By the only means available—a peace policy, a policy of collective security.

There is wisdom and truth in the conclusions reached, for example, by the Foreign Policy Association in its August report ("Struggle of the Powers in China", by T. A. Bisson):

> "At the present time, the Chinese nationalist movement constitutes the most powerful barrier to Japan's advance. The growing strength of this movement, supplemented by concerted Anglo-American-Soviet action, holds out perhaps the last remaining possibility of halting Japan and enforcing a settlement that may yet check the drift toward war in the Far East."

The same principle of collective security must also guide American foreign policy in the Western Hemisphere as well as in Europe.

* * *

CUBA, not Canada, is the acid test of the "good neighbor" policy of the Roosevelt administration in the Western Hemisphere. We say this in answer to President Roosevelt's declaration in Chautauqua that the "noblest monument to peace" and, by implication, to Roosevelt's policy of the "good neighbor" in the Americas is the fact that on the whole Canadian-U.S. frontier there is "no barbed wire, no gun or soldier and no passport".

Canada is a chapter by itself, and we cannot go into it now, except to say that the Caribbean and Central and South America are the regions that are more relevant than Canada to illustrate the working out of the good neighbor policy. And in these more relevant regions we have: Batista and Caffery in Cuba; Vargas in Brazil supported by the United States; unequal treaties that seek to subordinate the economic life of the Latin-American countries to Wall Street; intervention of many forms, short of military, which we don't overlook, in the internal affairs of the Latin-American republics. In short, we have the Monroe Doctrine.

Of course, Roosevelt's methods in Latin America are different from Harding's, Coolidge's or Hoover's. And there can be no objection to Roosevelt pointing that out, as he did in Chautauqua, except on the part of the Republican Party. Outside of the Landon-Hearst-Coughlin camp of reaction and fascism, no American can desire to see the old days of marine rule come back to Latin America.

Yet the people of the United States and the peoples of Latin America want much more than that. They want a true peace policy in Latin America by the government of the United States.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roosevelt's policy today is not that at all. We cite again Cuba and Brazil. Many more examples could be cited.

The test for our government will be the forthcoming Inter-American Peace Conference scheduled to open on December 1, 1936, in Buenos Aires, Argentina. How does the American government prepare for that conference? Roosevelt's address in Chautauqua gives very little to go by. On the other hand there is considerable discussion in the general press as to what the United States should try to do at that conference, and much of this discussion gives little ground for comfort to those, here and in Latin America, who are genuinely interested in peace in the Western Hemisphere.

There are talk and rumor about creating a Pan-American League of Nations as a sort of rival and competitor to the Geneva League of Nations. There is further talk, and very insistent, that the United States government should do nothing to weaken the Monroe Doctrine. It is clear that the Inter-American Conference will fail miserably as a gathering for peace if these talks and rumors become the guiding line of the American delegation in Buenos Aires.

The first condition for a true peace policy in Latin America is the complete equality of the small nations with the biggest—the United States. Scrupulous observance not only in words but in deed of the national sovereignty of these small nations by the United States. Non-intervention in their internal affairs, whether through the method of Caffery-Batista or otherwise. Complete abandonment of the use of force in the collection of debts defaulted to Wall Street. Abolition of all unequal treaties. In other words, the abolition of the Monroe Doctrine.

The second condition for a true peace policy in the Western Hemisphere is the collaboration of the American nations with the peaceful nations of other parts of the world in the interests of peace. A regional pact of mutual assistance and security of the American nations can be achieved, but only on the basis of complete equality and non-intervention and in collaboration with all peace forces in the world. This means, not withdrawal from the League of Nations by the Latin-American countries, not rivalry with it, but support by the American nations of all those measures of the League of Nations that tend to curb the aggressors and preserve peace.

Of course, Hearst, Landon and Coughlin do not desire such a policy. And quite naturally so. These reactionaries and fascists, especially Hearst and Coughlin, incite to war against Mexico. Hearst attacks even the British government (mind you, the Baldwin cabinet) for its sympathy with the "Reds". It is clear what Hearst is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seeking. He wants Britain to side completely and decisively with Mussolini and Hitler. He wants the American government to do the same thing.

Can Roosevelt afford to conciliate these reactionaries and still make a success of the Inter-American Peace Conference? No. This is impossible. This way lie failure of the conference, a worsening of the relations between the Latin-American countries and the United States, and a strengthening of the war forces. Should Roosevelt choose to placate Wall Street and the Landons, the beneficiaries will be not the United States but Japan, Hitler, Mussolini.

The American labor movement, the toiling farmers, and all progressive forces in the country are vitally interested in the kind of policy that will be pursued by the American government at the Inter-American Peace Conference. The Farmer-Labor Party movement is vitally interested in that. All these forces should therefore raise their voices in favor of an American peace policy—for the Far East, for the Western Hemisphere, for the whole world.

* * *

SPAIN presents us with the same fundamental issues of today—the preservation of peace and democracy.

Can the American people remain "neutral" to this struggle? To ask the question is to answer it. Hitler and Mussolini are not neutral. They have helped prepare the fascist mutiny in Spain. They are daily intervening on behalf of the mutineers with bombing planes, munitions, money and open political support. They are in effect mobilizing for war to impose their will in the Spanish situation.

Hearst & Co. are not neutral either. Our "own" American reactionaries and fascists are supporting the Spanish fascist mutineers against the legitimate democratic government of Spain. Hearst & Co. are brazenly supporting the Hitler and Mussolini game in the Spanish struggle.

What is the position of the American government?

We are told that the position is one of non-intervention. The American State Department claims to follow a policy of "impartiality". Is it, though? Even a child can understand that to be "impartial" as between the fascist mutineers and the legitimate democratically elected government of Spain means to be partial in favor of the fascist mutineers. *To place the insurrectionists on the same footing with the government is to help the insurrection.*

We do not say that President Roosevelt wants to help the fascist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mutineers against the democratic government of Spain. But his so-called "impartial" attitude tends to achieve precisely that result. It is another demonstration of how neutrality really works out in practice.

The American people cannot be neutral. The American workers, farmers, middle classes, Negroes and all honest supporters of democracy and peace are vitally interested in the victory of the Spanish people over the fascist insurrectionists. A victory of the fascists in Spain will strengthen reaction everywhere. It will strengthen reaction in the United States. On the other hand, a victory of democracy in Spain will strengthen the progressive forces in all countries, also in this country.

The American people are therefore in duty bound to do all in their power to help defeat the Spanish fascist insurrection, to help defeat the war plans and intervention of Hitler and Mussolini in Spain.

It is not true, of course, that the struggle in Spain is between fascism and Communism. That's what Hitler and Mussolini say. That's what the Trotskyite assassins say. That's what Hearst & Co. say. But there is as much truth in that as there is in another assertion of Hearst that Roosevelt is a Communist, or that the issue in the presidential elections in this country is Americanism versus Communism.

Since the overthrow of the monarchy, the Spanish people were engaged in the process of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. For what purpose? To establish a democratic government, civil liberties, separation of church from state, to free the peasants from peonage and to enable them to secure land, to improve the conditions of the working class and to collaborate with other powers for the maintenance of peace.

Monarchist reaction and fascism wouldn't let this process go on peacefully. Reaction sought to restore the old order, resorting to the most violent and brutal means for suppressing the people. Lack of unity in the democratic camp played repeatedly into the hands of the reactionaries and fascists.

But in February, 1936, a People's Front was established. As a result reaction was decisively defeated in the parliamentary elections and a Left Republican government was placed in power, supported by the People's Front. This created the possibility for an orderly process of completing the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Spain. And this—not Communism—was precisely what alarmed the fascist and reactionaries. They saw themselves beaten in a democratic election, repudiated by the Spanish people. They

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

realized that, because of the existence of the People's Front, they could no longer use the parliamentary institutions for blocking the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Spain. They realized that the old order of monarchist reaction was disappearing forever, and that they were helpless to prevent this in a democratic way.

Here Mussolini and Hitler came to the rescue. Prompted and supported by these two enemies of the world, Spanish reaction and fascism resorted to mutiny. The Spanish Communists, Socialists, Syndicalists and all sincere Republicans rushed to the defense of the democratic institutions of their country and of the existing legitimate government of Spain.

This is how the present struggle originated. The issue is: Democracy and peace versus fascism and war.

On this issue the American people cannot and will not remain "*neutral*".

The capitalist press of this country shows very little faith in bourgeois democracy when it repeatedly gives vent to scepticism as to whether democracy can survive in Spain. It is becoming stylish even for some who pretend to be "liberals" to assert knowingly that, whoever wins in Spain, democracy will lose.

It wouldn't hurt to say bluntly here that those liberals who incline to take that position are in effect beginning to capitulate to Hitler and Hearst.

But the American people will not take the road of capitulation to fascism, whether at home or abroad. The American masses, responding to the needs of their most vital interests, will support the Spanish people and their fight for democracy and peace against the fascist mutineers and their masters—Hitler and Mussolini.

Organized labor must take the lead. Hearst's attacks upon the trade unions that have contributed money for the Spanish people will only stimulate the workers to greater efforts on behalf of peace and democracy for which the Spanish masses are freely giving their lives. Every labor organization should contribute to the utmost —in money, in demonstrations of protest against the Hitler-Mussolini intervention in Spain, in resolutions of solidarity with the Spanish people and their government, in demands upon the American government to let no assistance of any kind go to the fascist mutineers, to let the legitimate government of Spain acquire everything it needs in the United States, and to place the full influence of this country on the side of democracy and peace and against the intervention of Hitler and Mussolini.

Many labor organizations have already acted in this sense. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Federation of Labor as such is committed by decision of its last national convention to opposition to fascism and to rendering assistance to the people abroad that are fighting against fascism. This is the time to put this commitment into telling and effective deeds.

The more activities labor will display in support of the Spanish people the more will other classes and groups join in this people's front in support of democracy and peace. The farmers, the city middle classes, the Negroes, every opponent of fascism and reaction in this country can be won to join in rendering active support to the Spanish people and their government. The Farmer-Labor Party forces of this country and Labor's Non-Partisan League are in a position to render very effective service to this cause. In doing so, they will help not only the Spanish people but also the American people.

* * *

IF ONLY in passing, it is necessary to inquire: Why does the *Socialist Call* pay so little attention to the Spanish struggle? Surely the Socialist Party membership wants to see the victory of the Spanish people against the fascists. Is the *Socialist Call* so busy that it can find no time for Spain?

We know, of course, that the Trotskyite invasion into the S.P. has considerably weakened that party. We have pointed out that danger before. Now the danger will become even more acute. Trotsky has been found out to be an organizer of assassinations *as a method of struggle* against the socialist and Soviet system in the U.S.S.R. The agents of the assassin, who is collaborating with Hitler's secret police, are in the very midst of the Socialist Party. This presents the S.P. with an acute problem: How can they continue to tolerate such people in their midst without injuring irretrievably their name as a workers' organization?

We also know that a good deal of the hostility of the *Socialist Call* to the People's Front in Spain is a result of Trotskyite pressure and influence. We have said many times that this Trotskyite hostility to the People's Front constitutes aid and comfort to fascism. Will the *Socialist Call* realize now that it is so? Will it also realize that by continuing the hostility to the People's Front it assumes responsibility for Trotsky's collaboration with Hitler's Gestapo?

The two are not separable, as is clearly evident today.

When Hitler sends warships to Spain and Hitler's secret police help Trotsky agents (with false passports and otherwise) to sneak

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into the Soviet Union to assassinate leaders of the working class, Hitler is doing two separate things but he is pursuing one aim. He works for fascism and war.

When Trotsky and the Trotskyites incite hostility to the People's Front in Spain (as well as in France and in the United States), and when Trotsky collaborates with Hitler's secret police to send assassins into the Soviet Union, he too is doing two separate things. But he pursues one aim. He, like Hitler, is working for fascism and war.

Will the *Socialist Call* continue to assume responsibility for Trotsky's doings?

* * *

THE trial of Zionviev-Kamenev and of the Trotsky-Gestapo agents, which took place in Moscow, is of tremendous importance.

For one thing, the conspirators and assassins did not succeed in their dastardly plans. And every friend of the Soviet Union, every decent human being, will bless the Soviet authorities for their vigilance and energy in discovering in time the conspiracy and checking it.

Every friend of human decency, let alone anti-fascists, Socialists, trade unionists, will give a sigh of relief at learning that the conspirators, excepting their "master mind", Trotsky, were safely disposed of and were unable to carry through their murderous plans.

Under the guidance of Trotsky, they adopted the way of assassination and murder of the leaders of the people in order, as they say, to overthrow the Soviet government. They couldn't, of course, succeed in overthrowing the Soviet government. This they must have felt in their own corrupted hearts. But they might have succeeded in assassinating some of its leaders—our leaders, the pride and path-blazers of the oppressed throughout the world.

They did succeed in assassinating Kirov. And Kirov is no more.

But this time they did not succeed. And blessed be the power of the Soviet people that brought this about.

Some are wondering how the hand even of a degenerated Zinoviev and of a counter-revolutionary Trotskyite could raise itself against Stalin, Voroshilov, Kaganovich?

Well, some of their agents couldn't; and committed suicide rather than carry out the assassination orders of their "masters", Zinoviev and Trotsky.

But it is well to remember that the hand of a counter-revolu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tionary assassin was raised also against Lenin; and it was the hand of a "Socialist-Revolutionary".

Now the party of the Socialist-Revolutionaries was a revolutionary petty-bourgeois party fighting against tsarism. As a party it became counter-revolutionary when the Socialist Revolution began to mature. As a party, it then joined hands with the monarchists and foreign intervention to defeat the Socialist Revolution. And when this took place the rest followed as a matter of course. The worse elements of this counter-revolutionary party undertook to strike at the Socialist Revolution by trying to assassinate its heads. Hence they struck at Lenin.

Trotskyism developed from an opposition to Lenin within the Bolshevik Party into the vanguard of bourgeois counter-revolution against the Soviet Union. When this happened the rest had to follow. This is no fatalism. It is merely pointing to the inescapable logic of a political position.

More than that: when fascism raised its ugly head and the struggle for socialism in the capitalist world became a struggle between the camp of democracy and the camp of fascism, between reaction and progress, between peace and war, Trotskyism inevitably became an ally of fascism.

Yes, some say, that may be so objectively, as a result of Trotskyite policies; but does it follow that Trotsky *wanted* to help the facists? Does it follow that he had to resort to assassination when, as he claims, in his entire career he was against the use of individual terror?

The answer to this is: as a result of the facts brought out at the trial, Trotskyism today stands exposed not only as an ally of fascism objectively but as a current in fascism. *Trotskyism today is fascism.*

In this "transformation" of Trotskyism there is nothing especially new. It is no news that certain ideologists of petty-bourgeois "revolutionism" have turned fascist. Mussolini is an outstanding case. And as to Trotsky's career, it is precisely there that the key will be found to his present transformation into a fascist terrorist.

Lenin had shown long ago that Trotskyism as a political current was never anything else but petty-bourgeois "revolutionism". And as such, it always could become transformed (almost overnight) into the handmaiden of the wildest capitalist reaction. Trotskyism was always "Left phrases and Right deeds". This had its logic.

Trotsky is a mortal enemy of the socialist successes of the Soviet Union. Zinoviev and Kamenev were working with Trotsky. But their counter-revolutionary fight failed. Socialism triumphed and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with it Soviet democracy as demonstrated by the new Constitution. The Soviet people stood united as never before around their government and the Communist Party and around Stalin.

What was Trotsky's answer to that? Redoubled incitement against the leaders of the Soviet Union, especially the world leader of the camp of socialism and progress, Comrade Stalin. Incitement that was already carrying within itself the kernels of incitement to assassination. And these kernels came pretty soon to maturity.

Seeing the hopelessness of his counter-revolutionary efforts among the masses, Trotsky begins to unfold a line which, though still indirectly, openly calls for assassination. In an article entitled "The New Constitution of the U.S.S.R.", published in the *New Militant* on May 9, Trotsky writes:

> ". . . At the dawn of the Soviet power the terrorist acts were perpetrated by S.-R.'s and the Whites in the atmosphere of the still unfinished civil war. When the former ruling classes abandoned all their hopes, terrorism disappeared as well. Kulak terror, traces of which are observable even now, was always local in character, and was an accompaniment of the partisan war against the Soviet regime. This is not what Molotov had in mind. *The new terror does not lean upon the old ruling classes or the kulaks. The terrorists of recent years are recruited exclusively from among the Soviet youth, from the ranks of the Y. C. L. and of the Party.* While utterly impotent to solve those tasks which it set itself, *individual terror is, however, of the greatest symptomatic importance because it characterizes the sharpness of the antagonism between the bureaucracy and the wide masses of the people, especially the younger generation. Terrorism is the tragic accompaniment of Bonapartism.*"

In print, publicly, Trotsky "only" gives justification for assassination. Through his agents and secretly, as now disclosed at the trial, Trotsky gives orders to assassinate.

Publicly and in print both Trotsky and Goebbels denounce the new Soviet Constitution. Goebbels calls it "tyranny"; Trotsky calls it "Bonapartism".

Secretly both Trotsky and Goebbels' friend, Himmler, the head of the Gestapo, fit out false passports and other equipment for Trotskyists to enter the Soviet Union to assassinate Soviet leaders.

These are facts. And these established facts spell out one thing: *Trotskyism is fascist terrorism.*

We want to hope that the Socialist Party, invaded as it has become by Trotskyism, will find within itself enough proletarian and socialist strength to draw the proper conclusions from this fact.

* * *

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FASCISM in the United States has taken another step in the direction of building for itself a mass movement. This was what Coughlin undertook at the Cleveland convention of the National Union for Social Justice.

The original 16-point principles of the organization were superseded by new resolutions which also contain 16 points. And though guardedly phrased, the fascist content of these new 16 points cannot be mistaken.

Under cover of demagogic friendship for labor, Coughlin and his aides are assailing organized labor and especially the C.I.O. and Labor's Non-Partisan League. Anti-Semitism and war against Communism are placed by Coughlin as the chief aims of the N.U.S.J. Defense of the Supreme Court as against Congress is brought forth as the main task of the organization. The N.U.S.J. is made to become the champion of Mussolini and Hitler in the United States. Inflation continues the chief bait with which Coughlin seeks to inveigle the farmers into his fascist movement.

The N.U.S.J. will campaign for Lemke in order to help elect Landon, in the expectation that Landon will make the road easier for the coming of fascism. At the same time Coughlin is trying to bring into his fascist outfit some of the traditionally third-party and Farmer-Labor elements, concentrating especially on the Congressional elections.

For the Communists and the Young Communist League the task is clear. Systematic work in the units of the N.U.S.J. becomes a task of first rate importance. The struggle for inner democracy and against the dictatorship of Coughlin is a fundamental issue in the organization. The so-called Constitution merely legalizes this dictatorship. To fight for democracy in the N.U.S.J. means also to arouse the membership to the danger of fascism which Coughlin carries and to the struggle for democracy generally.

Of equal importance is the struggle within the N.U.S.J. for a program of immediate partial demands and legislative measures that will incorporate the original 16 principles of the organization which Coughlin has abandoned and betrayed. *Especially the principle of nationalization of banks and all public necessities.* Very vital is the exposure of Coughlin's *inflation policies* before the city middle classes whom Coughlin is trying to capture.

As to political action in the elections, by the units of the N.U.S.J., our task is twofold: (a) to win them away from giving any sort of support to Lemke; (b) to win them for common action with local and Congressional Farmer-Labor forces in the putting forth of joint candidates.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Every organization of the Party and of the Y.C.L. should from now on pay the closest attention to the life of the N.U.S.J. units in their respective localities and organize intensive work within them along the above lines. We must clearly understand that the fight against fascism in the United States means at the present time to work for the defeat of reaction in the elections (Landon), to scotch the Coughlin-Lemke maneuver, and to prevent Coughlin from building up the N.U.S.J. into a fascist organization. It means in this way to build the Farmer-Labor Party and to strengthen the Communist Party.

But the efforts of the Communists alone are insufficient. The Farmer-Labor Party movement and Labor's Non-Partisan League must begin to cooperate at once systematically and closely for the accomplishment of the above aims. It is most vital that Coughlin and Gerald K. Smith be prevented from establishing themselves as the "inheritors" and debauchers of the third-party movements in this country.

From this angle it was gratifying to see that the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party and the Wisconsin Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation have at last taken a step which is bound to be most useful. Following a meeting of the executive boards of these organizations, a statement was issued to build "a unified national Farmer-Labor Party for the Congressional campaign of 1938 and the Presidential campaign of 1940". This is good. Yet it is insufficient to meet the need of the Congressional elections of 1936. We must have joint action by the Farmer-Labor forces in the Congressional elections *this year*, to meet effectively the Coughlin Congressional campaign.

We wish especially to commend the appeal of the Minnesota and Wisconsin organizations for immediate national consolidation of the new political alignment. The appeal says:

> "We believe that the new national alignment must be established as soon as possible regardless of the fact that no unity of action can be reached in the Presidential campaign.
>
> "We believe that the many important groups, economic and political, which hold as we do, should align themselves regardless of their stand in the present campaign."

This again is of great importance. And we hope Labor's Non-Partisan League will respond to this appeal very soon and wholeheartedly.

Lewis, Hillman and Berry have spoken, with various degrees of emphasis, of the *coming realignment* and its significance for labor.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This note was also very audible in their speeches at the first national gathering of Labor's Non-Partisan League in Washington. If these prognostications are to have any practical meaning, steps must be taken now and immediately to lay the foundation for this realignment. The appeal by the Minnesota and Wisconsin organizations indicates the way.

Above all we must stress again the thing which is unfortunately missing in the appeal, namely, independent action by the Farmer-Labor and other progressive forces *in the Congressional elections this year*.

The Communists will continue to work tirelessly for the building of local and state Farmer-Labor Parties, urging great concentration on the Congressional elections.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Election Campaign Outline for 1936

I. The Issue in 1936

1. The Republican Party says: Capitalism or socialism.
2. The Democratic Party says: Defeat the "economic royalists".
3. The Union Party says: Roosevelt and ruin.
4. The Socialist Party says: Socialism or capitalism.
5. The Communist Party says: Democracy or fascism, progress or reaction.

II. Programs and Parties

1. The Republican Party wishes to remove all remnants of popular influence on the government, and moves in the direction of fascism and war. Its program is directed towards cutting wages, raising prices, smashing the trade unions, squeezing the poor and tenant farmers out of agriculture, cutting relief, and wiping out all social and labor legislation.

2. The Democratic Party under Roosevelt strives to follow a middle course. As between reaction and democracy, it wavers between pressure from the reactionaries and pressure from the progressives. This indecisiveness shows that the Democratic Party is no barrier against fascism. The progressive forces in the United States must organize for independent political action in the Farmer-Labor Party, which is the specific American form of the people's front against reaction, fascism and war.

3. The Union Party is a conspiracy of Hearst and Coughlin which aims to make use of disillusionment with capitalism in order to elect Landon by diverting votes from Roosevelt. It is a fake third party and a vote for Lemke is a vote for Landon and Wall Street.

4. The Socialist Party refuses to see the immediate menace of fascism, and is indifferent to the need for a broad united front to defeat the reactionaries in the Liberty League and the Republican Party. It does not see that there can be no effective fight against capitalism without fighting against the immediate menace of reaction.

5. Labor's Non-Partisan League is supporting the re-election of Roosevelt. It says that Landon and Knox must be defeated at all costs. It has taken hesitating steps in the direction of a Farmer-Labor Party by organizing the American Labor Party in New York State.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has not attempted to unite with the great mass of Coughlinites and Townsendites to form an independent force which could force Roosevelt more to the Left.

6. The Communist Party has as its main goal in the campaign the strengthening of the Farmer-Labor movement. It is working to form an enduring alliance with labor, the farmers, the city middle classes and all progressives in a front of the people against the reactionaries. It strives to speed up the break-away of the people from the two old capitalist parties, and take them on the road to independent organization and political action. It stands for a program around which millions can be rallied to the Farmer-Labor Party. It supports higher wages and a higher standard of living. It is for a powerful trade union movement comprising the entire working class. It fights to save the farmers from ruin. It demands that the Supreme Court be curbed, and that social and labor legislation be further extended. It is for balancing the budget at the expense of the rich, with all necessary funds being taken from the profits of the political and economic exploiters of the people—out of the accumulated wealth of Wall Street. It strives to defend and extend democratic rights and seeks to keep America out of war by keeping war out of the world.

III. Candidates

1. Alfred M. Landon was picked as the Republican candidate by Hearst and the Liberty League. He is the candidate of the most reactionary groups in the country who seek to establish fascism behind a smokescreen of Main Street "liberalism". He thinks that $1.08 a week is enough to feed an unemployed family. He is the tool of the oil interests and Wall Street. He stands for the open-shop policy of the Iron and Steel Institute. He is for a fake independence in world affairs behind which he would throw the United States on to the side of the war-makers throughout the world.

2. Franklin D. Roosevelt attacks the "princes of privilege" but he is no barrier against fascism. In the past he retreated constantly before the attacks of the reactionaries. Recently he has wavered a little to the Left, because of pressure from labor and progressives. He strives to steer a middle course between the growing menace of reaction, and the development of the Farmer-Labor Party movement.

3. William Lemke is a stooge for Landon. He is being used by Coughlin and Hearst to divert people disillusioned with the failure of the New Deal to carry out its promises to the "forgotten man" into fascist channels. It is now known that he made speeches in Congress praising Hearst. He uses vague phrases to attract the farmer and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worker, but is silent on the questions of higher wages, trade union organization, old age pensions, relief to the unemployed and help to the farmers.

4. Norman Thomas has issued the same slogan as the reactionaries—socialism or capitalism. He does not attack Landon and the Republican Party as the chief enemy of the American people. He gave Landon the opportunity to parade as a friend of labor by enabling him to conceal the Republican defense of the open shop. He tilts at fascism in the abstract instead of fighting the Liberty League and the other reactionaries. And instead of uniting with all progressive forces in a Farmer-Labor Party, he contents himself with discussing an abstract socialism.

5. Earl Browder has declared that the chief enemy of the peace, freedom, and prosperity of the American people is the Republican Party and its reactionary allies, Hearst, the Liberty League, Wall Street. He points out that the rising danger of fascism and war call for a united people's front—for the trade unions, farmers' organizations, progressives, Socialists and Communists to unite in a Farmer-Labor Party. He has said that the majority of the American people are not this year ready for socialism, but they are ready to join hands to smash the menace of fascism. He has shown that in fighting for their immediate demands the people will gain deeper political experience and understanding which will prepare them for the great decisions to come when it will be necessary to move forward to socialism.

IV. Platforms

1. Relief and Social Security.

a. The Republicans and Landon wish to cut relief and turn over the relief administration to local agencies. What is taking place in New Jersey where the unemployed are dying of starvation is a practical example of what Landon would do on a national scale. They would abolish the W.P.A. and end the Public Works program. They are opposed to any system of federal social insurance.

b. Roosevelt and the Democrats "believe that unemployment is a national problem and that it is an unescapable obligation of our government to meet it in a national way". They are in favor of some relief and a certain measure of social security, both inadequate to meet the real needs of the unemployed.

c. Lemke and the Union Party have absolutely nothing to say on the problem of relief to the unemployed. They make vague promises about some sort of "assurance" to the aged and young, but nothing concrete is proposed.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

d. Browder and the Communists were pioneers in the fight for relief and social security. They demand adequate relief standards and a stop to all relief cuts. They demand that the government continue and extend the W.P.A. They favor an extensive Federal Works Program which would provide housing at low rentals, schools, hospitals, health and recreational facilities as provided for in the $6,000,000,000 appropriation in the Marcantonio Relief Standards Bill. They demand that the government provide unemployment insurance, old age pensions, and social security for all through the Frazier-Lundeen Bill.

e. Thomas and the Socialists, on the question of relief and social security, have essentially the same stand as the Communists.

2. Jobs and Wages.

a. The Republicans promise to give jobs instead of relief. In practice, however, the Liberty Leaguers who dictate Republican policy are lengthening hours and increasing speed-up. This is throwing workers out of jobs. With Landon the workers will land in the street as more goods are produced with fewer workers. The big industrialists who are backing Landon have repeatedly stated that they cannot and will not reabsorb the unemployed into industry.

b. The Democrats speak of higher wages and a shorter working week, but in practice they have permitted the Supreme Court to emasculate all labor legislation.

c. The Union Party holds forth the promise of "an annual wage", but no concrete way is presented of how this will be achieved. Furthermore, this is to be given only to "laborers capable of working and willing to work", thus leaving room for any action including wage cuts and forced labor. There is no mention of higher wages or a shorter working week.

d. The Communists would "give every working man and woman a real American standard of living with a minimum annual wage guaranteed by law". They favor higher wages and vacations with pay, with the abolition of the wage differential between the North and the South. They demand a thirty-hour week without reduction in earnings, at trade union rates and conditions, in private industry and on public works. They would open the closed factories and operate them for the benefit of the people.

e. The Socialists are for "the establishment of the thirty-hour week".

3. Youth.

a. The Republicans are silent on youth problems.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

b. The Democrats promise to keep youth on the road to freedom and prosperity, but make no concrete recommendations.

c. The Union Party like the Republican Party offers nothing specific to the youth.

d. Socialists and Communists call for the adoption of the American Youth Act and the end of child labor by a constitutional amendment. The Communists propose that the National Youth Administration budget be maintained and enlarged and that military training in the C.C.C. and schools be abolished. The Socialists, instead of asking for the extension of these inadequate measures, ask for their abolition.

4. Labor.

a. The Republicans stand for the open shop. Their labor plank uses the same words as the Iron and Steel Institute does in attacking the C.I.O.

b. The Democrats declare that the worker should have the right to collective bargaining and self-organization, free from interference of employers.

c. The Union Party, as on all significant questions, is silent on the rights of labor.

d. The Communists champion the unrestricted right to organize and strike. They propose federal legislation which would establish labor's full right to collective bargaining, which would outlaw the company union, the spy and stool-pigeon systems and all other coercion by the employer.

e. The Socialists urge the abolition of all laws that interfere with the peaceful activities of labor to organize.

5. The Farmers.

a. The Republicans offer nothing definite to the farmer.

b. The Democrats favor production of all the market will absorb and promise full cooperation of the government in the refinancing of farmer indebtedness at the lowest possible rates of interest and over a long term of years. They are silent on drought relief, and there are no specific recommendations for the tenant farmers.

c. The Union Party poses inflation as an answer to the farmers' problems and gives a vague assurance, without any specific recommendations, of production at a profit. As with all their planks, there are no details.

d. The Socialists propose the abolition of tenant farming and the conversion of plantation and corporation farms into cooperative farms. They advocate that farm prices be stabilized at cost of pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duction. They propose immediate relief for debt-laden farmers by advancing credit to working farmers. Crop insurance is to be provided by income, inheritance and corporation taxes.

e. The Communists demand that the farmers be freed from debts, unbearable tax burdens, and foreclosures. They demand the guarantee of the land to those who till the soil. They propose the immediate refinancing of the farmers' debts with government loans at nominal interest, a stop to evictions and foreclosures and a long term moratorium on all needy farmers' debts and that measures be taken to provide land for the landless farmers. They favor a graduated land tax to prevent the accumulation of large land holdings in the hands of the insurance companies, private and government banks, and other absentee owners, exemption from taxation of small operating farmers and farm cooperatives. They are unalterably opposed to the policy of crop destruction and curtailment. They support government regulation of farm prices with the aim of guaranteeing to the farmer his cost of production. They urge scientific soil conservation with compensation to farmer-owners and tenants for loss of income.

6. The Budget and Taxes.

a. The Republicans would balance the budget by cutting relief expenditures drastically and immediately, by increasing consumer taxes and by lightening the taxes on the rich,

b. The Democrats talk about balancing the budget, but do not come out for a balanced budget at the expense of the rich.

c. The Union Party in the words of Hearst demands that private property shall be protected from confiscation through unnecessary taxation, an argument borrowed from the Liberty Leaguers.

d. The Socialists propose a drastic increase in income and inheritance taxes on the higher income levels and wide experimentation in land values taxation.

e. The Communists say the rich hold the wealth of our country. They demand that the rich pay the cost of the crisis. They propose that social and labor legislation shall be financed and the budget balanced by taxation upon the rich. They are opposed to the sales tax in any form, including processing taxes, and call for their immediate repeal. They propose that the main source of government finance be a system of sharply graduated taxation upon incomes of over $5,000 a year, upon corporate profits and surpluses, as well as taxation upon the present tax-exempt securities and large gifts and inheritances. People of small income, small property and home-owners must be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

protected against foreclosures and seizures and from burdensome taxes and high interest rates.

7. Civil Liberties.

a. The Republicans make the demagogic promise to uphold civil rights. But in practice they deny freedom of speech, press, radio and assemblage to the workers. And their sponsors, the Liberty Leaguers, are behind the fascist bands and vigilantes who are attacking civil liberties and preparing for their eventual destruction.

b. The Democrats make a promise to guard the freedom of speech, press, radio, religion, and assembly, with equal rights to all and special privileges to none, but they are silent on the question of Negro oppression, and reactionaries within the Democratic Party are responsible for some of the worst attacks against civil liberties.

c. The Union Party in true fascist style maintains an ominous silence about civil liberties.

d. The Socialists urge the abolition of all laws that interfere with civil rights and are for the enforcement of constitutional guarantees of economic, political, and social equalities for the Negro people and all other oppressed minorities. They are opposed to Jim-Crow laws and for the enactment of drastic anti-lynching measures.

e. The Communists champion the unrestricted freedom of press, radio, speech and assembly and call upon the people to safeguard these traditional liberties. They demand the release of all class war prisoners. They demand that anti-Semitic propaganda be prohibited by law. They favor the re-establishment of the traditional American right of asylum for political refugees. They demand full rights for the Negro people who should be guaranteed complete equality in all spheres of life. They demand heavy penalties against mob rule with the death penalty for lynchers. They demand the enforcement of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution.

8. Money and Banking.

a. The Republicans stand for measures which will increase the stranglehold of Wall Street on the banking system of the country.

b. The Democrats promise to continue the policies of Roosevelt and curb some of the worst excesses of the bankers and speculators.

c. The Union Party stands for inflation which would ruin the workers, the farmers, the middle class people. It is opposed to nationalizing the banking system, a principle of the National Union for Social Justice which Coughlin has betrayed in the interests of the money changers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

d. The Communists are unconditionally opposed to inflationary policies which would bring catastrophe and ruin to the workers, farmers, and middle classes and enrich the speculators. They favor nationalization of the entire banking system and democratic control of its management.

e. The Socialists are silent on these important issues.

9. Monopoly.

a. The Republican Party is the party of Wall Street, of the monarchs of monopoly. It makes demagogic attacks against monopoly —a case of Wall Street shadow-boxing with itself.

b. The Democrats stand for measures which are only feeble gestures in the direction of government regulation of the monopolies.

c. The Union Party faces both ways by urging Congress to protect all industry and private enterprise, and at the same time comes out demagogically for the reactionary utopian proposal of breaking up large-scale industry. Coughlin, like Hitler, in this way hopes to win the small shopkeepers by conducting a verbal crusade against the trusts and chain stores.

d. The Communist Party has as one of its planks that our economy must be taken from the incompetent and greedy hands of Wall Street. The rationalization of the banking system and opening the closed factories are steps in this direction.

e. The Socialist Party apparently thinks that the way to fight for socialism in 1936 is to remain silent on the question of monopoly control by Wall Street.

10. The Supreme Court.

a. The Republicans whitewash the usurped powers of the judiciary and pledge themselves to restrict all attempts to impair the authority of the Supreme Court of the United States.

b. The Democrats evade the issue of Congress asserting its authority over the judiciary and instead promise to seek a constitutional amendment in an unnamed future.

c. The Union Party proves its fascist character by remaining silent on the question of abolishing the usurped powers of the Supreme Court. Coughlin and Lemke make Liberty League speeches defending the Courts and their usurped powers.

d. The Socialists favor an amendment ending the usurped power of the Supreme Court.

e. The Communists have a plank which supports a constitutional amendment which would put an end to the dictatorial and usurped

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

powers of the Supreme Court. They demand that Congress immediately reassert its constitutional powers to enact social and labor legislation and to curb the usurpation of the judiciary.

11. Foreign Relations and War.

a. The Republican Party is committed to an aggressive policy of intensive war preparations, which in effect is similar to that of Hearst, who under cover of isolation, seeks to ally himself with Hitler, Mussolini and the other fascist war-makers.

b. The Democratic Party urges that the profits be taken out of war. It stands for a neutrality which in practice tends to favor and encourage the war-makers and aggressive nations.

c. The Union Party stands for the program of our worst jingoes who propose conscription of labor during war. They are for armed intervention in Mexico.

d. The Socialists are for the maintenance of friendly relations with the Soviet Union. They do not favor participation in collective action against the war-makers.

e. The Communists would keep America out of war by keeping war out of the world. They believe that the United States should develop an American peace policy in close collaboration with the Soviet Union and all peace forces. They demand the nationalization of the entire munitions industry. They demand the strengthening of all measures for collective security against Hitler Germany, Italian fascism, and Japanese miltiarism. They demand an end to American intervention in the internal affairs of Latin America. They support complete independence and self-determination of all oppressed nations.

V. Recommended Reading List

1. *Democracy or Fascism*, Report to the Ninth National Convention of the Communist Party, by Earl Browder.
2. *Communist Election Platform.*
3. *Acceptance Speeches* of Earl Browder and James W. Ford.
4. *Who Are the Americans?* by Earl Browder.
5. *How to Win Social Justice—Can Coughlin and Lamke Do It?* by Alex Bittelman.
6. *The Truth About the Liberty League*, by Grace Hutchins. (*To appear shortly.*)
7. *The Black Legion Rides*, by George Morris.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

8. Biographies of Earl Browder and James W. Ford. (*To appear shortly.*)
9. "Notes of the Month," by A.B. (Appearing monthly in *The Communist.*
10. "Platforms and Issues in 1936," by David Ramsey. (In *The Communist* for July.)
11. Roosevelt and the Democratic Platform," by David Ramsey. (In *The Communist* for August.)
12. Campaign speeches by Browder and Ford, appearing currently in the *Daily Worker.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fighting for Democracy in Spain

By CLARENCE A. HATHAWAY

(Speech Delivered at Madison Square Garden, New York City, August 18, 1936)

COMRADES AND FRIENDS: The Spanish people are today in the front line trenches fighting against fascism. The workers, the peasants and large sections of the Spanish middle class are bearing the brunt of the battle against fascist reaction that is sharpening in every country and on a world scale. The Spanish people today are in the leadership in the fight for democracy and in the fight for peace.

On July 15 the fascists of Spain began a military insurrection, and for the last 34 days the Spanish government, backed by the Socialists and Communists and by the overwhelming majority of the Spanish people, has been fighting heroicly against these barbaric reactionary forces. The heroism of the Spanish people has been epochal. With inadequate preparations, with insufficient military supplies, with a virtual blockade maintained against the government by the surrounding reactionary nations, the Spanish people have been fighting with such weapons as they could secure against military forces that not only took over a large portion of the military supplies of the nation, but who have been supplied since then by fascist Germany and Italy.

When one considers that the biggest portion of the army joined the insurrection of the fascists against the government, and that the defense of the Azana government, of the republic, was carried on in the main by workers' and peasants' militia, inadequately prepared and trained, inadequately armed, then one can realize what the people are going through today in the heroic effort they are making to prevent fascism from entrenching itself in Spain, from surrounding democratic France, from allying itself with Germany and Italy, from creating that force which would jeopardize democracy and peace on a world scale. That is why I emphasize the fact that the Spanish people today are not only waging a battle for their own freedom, for their own civil liberties, for a democratic Spain, but they are waging a battle for us and for the anti-fascist forces in every country throughout the world.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A defeat for the people in Spain would be a serious setback to the anti-fascist movement in every country. It would certainly make a thousand times more difficult the struggle that is being waged by the People's Front in France. Certainly our own reactionaries—the Hearsts, the Liberty Leaguers, the Landons and the Knoxes—would be strengthened here by a fascist victory there. Likewise reaction would be strengthened in England and in every other capitalist nation throughout the world.

But a victory for the people's movement in Spain, a victory for the present government, would undoubtedly mark a serious, a most decisive setback for fascism everywhere. It would strengthen our revolutionary struggle against our own reactionaries; it would strengthen the struggle of the German workers, the Italian workers and the workers in every country who are enslaved, persecuted and terrorized by fascist dictatorships.

FASCIST INTERVENTION

The fascists in Spain have been able to carry on their murderous insurrection for 34 days and create critical problems for the workers' and peasants' movement, for the people's movement. They have been able to do this not primarily because of their own inner strength. On the contrary, the forces of fascism in Spain are not strong when compared with the strength of the government and of the People's Front movement. They represent the army officers, they represent the high dignitaries of the church, they represent the landlords, they represent, of course, the big bourgeoisie. The reason, and the primary reason, why the fascists, the arch-reactionaries of Spain, have been able to carry on the civil war for this period of time is because prior to the revolt, in the preparations for the revolt, and since the revolt, they have had the continuous, active backing of the two chief fascist nations—Italy and Germany.

Already there is much evidence brought to light, evidence that has appeared daily in the capitalist newspapers, which has proven that the revolt was hatched with the collaboration of Hitler. One of the outstanding Spanish fascist generals stayed in Berlin, conferring with Hitler. He was undoubtedly financed by Hitler, and from there went to Portugal to carry through the final preparations for the revolt. It has, furthermore, been made clear from the reports of the press that the rebels, those revolting against the democratically elected government of Spain, were supplied by the Nazis and Italian fascists with arms, with bombing planes, with machine guns, with everything they needed to carry through this counter-revolutionary

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

struggle that they are waging against the Azana government at the present time. The fact that Mussolini has likewise sent bombing planes, and with them Italian fascist aviators is today well-known. The fact that a couple of planes crashed in French Morocco clearly showed that the fascists of Spain were relying upon receiving this aerial help from the fascist governments of Italy and Germany.

I think from this there are very definite conclusions that can be drawn. Hitler and Mussolini are driving toward the realization of their fascist policies—a drive that, we Communists have pointed out repeatedly, can only end in the outbreak of a new world war that will be far more costly in its consequences than was the last world war. We have repeatedly branded these fascist nations as the aggressors in this world situation, threatening the peace of the entire world in the most irresponsible and criminal manner, undertaking to provoke such a war to serve their fascist objectives.

The events in Spain and the disclosures that have already been brought to light demonstrate most clearly that these fascist incendiaries do not hesitate to interfere in the internal affairs of another nation, they do not adopt a policy of "hands off", letting the people of Spain determine for themselves their form of government, their policies, etc. They allied themselves with the most barbaric, vilest kind of reactionary forces, with the semi-feudal remnants of Spain, with the old landlords, who have for centuries brutally oppressed the Spanish peasants. They allied themselves there with the reactionaries of the church who have for years extorted huge sums from the people. And through these forces Hitler and Mussolini undertake to overthrow a government that was duly established by the people, that was returned to office in the elections of February 16 with an overwhelming election victory; a government which has the support of workers and peasants and the middle class people of Spain as well.

DISORDER PROVOKED BY FASCISTS

Under such circumstances, with a government elected by democratic procedure, representing the people's expressed will, these fascists within Spain and the fascists surrounding Spain, in complete disregard of the election, in complete disregard of the will of the Spanish people, in complete disregard of peace and order, in which atmosphere the government was systematically undertaking to solve the problems of the Spanish people—the fascists, with the aid of Hitler and Mussolini, step in, throw the country into turmoil, begin a counter-revolutionary struggle, take the lives of tens of thousands of Spanish people of all classes, begin a ruthless war for power in order to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maintain a rotting system which has long since demonstrated its inability to serve the interests of the Spanish people, or of Spain as a nation.

Under such circumstances it must become clear to every anti-fascist, to every supporter of democracy, to every person who believes in orderly development, that the fascists in Spain must be defeated, that the Hitlers and Mussolinis must be told decisively by an aroused world opinion, not to intervene in Spain. The people of this country and every other country must be prepared to give unstintingly their support to the Spanish people in their struggle against fascist reaction, in their struggle to maintain a democratic regime in their country. We owe it to the Spanish people, because of the heroism that they are showing every day in their struggle to maintain their government—a government that is more responsive to their wishes than anything that has preceded it—and secondly to ourselves, in the interests of our fight for world peace, in the interest of our fight against growing fascism at home and against fascism on a world scale—to give all our support, to back up their fight as we have never supported any fight waged before.

Comrades, to give our support effectively to the masses in Spain in their struggle against reaction, it is necessary to trace briefly the developments of the struggle in Spain and the inner issues that preceded the present struggle. To begin with, one should state that the whole history of Spain is replete with many struggles of the masses of the people against the feudalism that has dominated Spain for a longer period than any other country of Europe. In fact, today Spain still suffers from semi-feudal conditions, with all of the remnants of feudalism bearing down on the mass of workers and peasants when feudalism has been wiped out in the other countries of Western Europe. The workers there have been waging throughout many years a struggle to overthrow this feudal regime, to open the way for progressive development in Spain.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BOURGEOIS DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION

In the present period the struggle against reaction has been developing since 1931, a revolutionary struggle directed against the carry-over of feudalism, a reaction that has throttled the whole development of Spain, which has prevented the opening up of Spain to progressive expansion. The tasks of the revolution in Spain which has been going on since 1931 were the tasks of a bourgeois democratic revolution. They were the task of establishing a republic, the task of ending once and for all the feudal relationships in the coun-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tryside with the terrific burden they placed on the peasants, the task of dividing the land, opening the way to the development of agriculture on a progressive basis. It meant the abolition of all of those feudal remnants which prevented the development of Spanish industry. It meant opening the way to the struggle for a real democracy in Spain, giving the workers the right to organize. In this struggle the workers were preparing themselves for the period when as a class they could go forward to a new stage in the struggle for progress, the struggle for socialism as against capitalism.

The wiping out of these feudal remnants, the completing of the bourgeois democratic revolution, was the line of development in Spain during this past period. The issue was clearly that and that issue could not be jumped over as some self-styled "Leftists" say.

You will remember that in the whole period beginning in 1905 in Russia, and right up to the February Revolution in 1917, Lenin constantly insisted that the task of the revolutionary movement in Russia was the task of carrying through the bourgeois democratic revolution. There the bourgeoisie itself played an ever decreasing role; the working class, in alliance with the peasantry, found itself compelled to do the job that historically should have been done by the class that preceded it in power. In Spain they are going through this bourgeois democratic process.

Since 1931, when the monarchy was overthrown, particularly in the period from 1931 to 1934, the characteristic of the government was one of vacillation, of compromise, of hesitation, of refusing to go through with those tasks that naturally would have followed the defeat of the monarchy. In that period even many of the Left elements in the working class movement believed that this could be accomplished without boldly and in a revolutionary manner breaking down the resistance of the landlords, of the big bourgeoisie who themselves hampered the unfolding of the bourgeois democratic revolution. As a result, instead of achieving fundamental gains for the workers and peasants, laws were adopted that were not put into effect. The reactionaries were given an opportunity to reconsolidate their position, and by 1934 those progressive forces that had played a role in the government were brushed aside. The reactionaries regained power and continued in power from then until in February of this year, when the People's Front won its decisive election victory.

The period of the past few years was a period characterized by growing reaction in Spain. The trend was toward the Right, toward reaction. That trend was broken by the heroic struggle of the Asturian miners toward the end of 1934. The struggle of these Socialists and Communists and Anarcho-Syndicalist miners was an example to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the masses. It showed that by taking things into their own hands and resorting to methods of struggle they could defeat the reactionaries. Although defeated, the Asturian revolt marked the beginning of the rallying of the masses in Spain for their victory on February 16 of this year and for the heroic struggle that the masses are today making in Spain against the forces of reaction.

Over 30,000 working class fighters in Spain were thrown into prison by the Gil Robles government and kept there until they were released by the people on February 16. But I emphasize that the struggle of the Asturian miners was the turning point in the fight against reaction in Spain, it was the beginning of that struggle which we hope will bring decisive victory to the people and the final and complete defeat of the forces of reaction.

FORGING THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

The struggle of the Asturian miners, the persecution and terror that followed, prepared the ground in the working class movement for the building of the People's Front. And here, comrades, I want to state that the People's Front in Spain, the bringing together of the Socialists, the Communists, the large masses of Anarcho-Syndicalists and the honest Republicans is due primarily to the initiative of the Communist Party of Spain in proposing the formation of a united front of the people against the fascists.

It was the Communist Party of Spain, following the line of the Communist International, drawing from the experiences of the workers' struggles in every country, from the victory of fascism in Germany, from the experience that they had gained in France, which boldly came forward, urging a united front of the Spanish working class movement and around that a broad People's Front as a means of beating back the forces of reaction.

When the Secretary of the Spanish Communist Party, Jose Diaz, took the initiative in propagating and in fighting for this line, a ready response was found in the ranks of the Spanish proletariat. There began the creation of that solid People's Front in Spain which has demonstrated its ability to carry on an election battle against reaction. Today it is demonstrating its ability and readiness to go into the trenches, into the streets in an armed battle against fascism, in order that democracy and peace might be maintained.

THE ELECTORAL VICTORY

The People's Front victory in February was an overwhelming victory. I will quote the figures to show how decisively the Spanish

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people spoke against the reactionary regime that until then had held power and in favor of progress and unity as expressed in the People's Front. In the old elections, the elections of 1933, all of the Left and republican parties combined had only 121 members in the Spanish parliament as against 352 for the combined Right and Centrist parties In the vote of February 16 the Left parties, the parties adhering to the People's Front, increased their number of representatives by 147, having 268 members in the Spanish parliament as against 205 by the reactionary groups.

That shows the complete reversal which took place in the sentiment of the people in support of a program that pledged the People's Front to the release of the 30,000 working class and anti-fascist prisoners, that pledged the carrying out of such land reforms as were demanded by the peasants, that pledged the legalization of the unions, the recognition of the unions in the factories, the granting of improved working conditions, and so forth. Not a vote for socialism, but a vote to carry out an elementary program around which all these groups could unite.

The vote in the elections showed that the people were for that program, that the people were against the reactionary parties who are today attempting to overthrow democracy by armed force.

After the parliamentary victory, after the victory of February 16, a government was set up that is not yet a People's Front government as we understand such a government. The Socialists are not participating in the government; the Communists are not participating in the government. The present government in Spain is a Left Republican government pledged to carry out the minimum program agreed upon in the election campaign. And on the basis of carrying out such a minimum program, a program directed against fascism and for the immediate needs of the people, the Socialists and Communists are giving that government their support.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

Now there have been those who say that this government, which succeeded in granting many concessions to the workers since it took office, that today is carrying on, is giving leadership in the armed struggle against the forces of fascism and for the defense of the republic—there are some who say that this government should not be supported. There are some "Leftists" who think that the whole policy of the People's Front is wrong. There are some of our comrades in the Socialist Party who think that the People's Front in France is wrong, who think that the People's Front in Spain is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wrong. In fact, only a couple of days before the outbreak of the present struggle in Spain to defeat the forces of counter-revolution, there were writers in the *Socialist Call* who at that late date and in that acute situation still considered that this broad unity of the Spanish people, workers, peasants, middle class groups, was an unsound policy, was a policy that should be ended by breaking up the People's Front movement.

But, comrades, let me state with all the power that I can command that only the People's Front could unite the Socialists, the Communists, the Anarcho-Syndicalists, the Left Republicans, the peasant groups, could today successfully beat back the forces of reaction in Spain.

If the People's Front movement had not been created, if the unity of these groups had not been established and the election victory of February 16 won, if a struggle had not been carried on against the consolidation of the fascist positions since February, then I assure you that the workers, the peasants and the anti-fascists of Spain would never have been able to wage the struggle that they are today waging against the forces of reaction. In fact, one can state that with all the limitations of the present government in Spain, a government that is not committed to a revolutionary program, a government that is committed only to the carrying through of the program of a democratic bourgeois revolution, with all of those limitations that government has carried through many substantial changes that were of fundamental importance to the workers' movement. And they were a prerequisite for the success of the struggle of the masses of the Spanish people against fascism.

THE COMMUNISTS LEAD FOR UNITY

To begin with, in this period the trade union movement, the Socialist and Communist movement, that had a semi-legal existence, have been fully legalized. They have been given an opportunity to carry on all the functions of trade union and working class movements under democratic conditions. The effect has been a tremendous strengthening of the trade union movement. It has resulted in a tremendous strengthening of the Communist movement, of the Socialist movement, of the youth movement, of the peasant movement. In fact, the period of the People's Front in Spain and the period since the victory on February 16 has been a period of a tremendous rallying of the forces of progress against the forces of reaction.

The trade union movement was formerly split into three different

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sections: a Socialist movement, one influenced by the Communists (a revolutionary trade union movement) and the Anarcho-Syndicalist trade union movement. Today, under new conditions and directly as an outgrowth of the creation of the People's Front, the trade unions led by the Socialists and Communists have been united. And with the unification of this movement has come a tremendous increase in strength. Even in the Anarcho-Syndicalist movement the effect on the people of the successful struggles of the People's Front has created so tremendous a sentiment for unity from below, that the leaders were compelled to recognize it. At their last Congress they came out with proposals for certain alliances with other working class groups in the struggle against reaction. There was still a hesitancy, a holding back from the full implications of the People's Front movement, but nevertheless the masses are being drawn into this movement, struggling side by side with the Socialists and Communists in the unions, in the factories, and now in the trenches.

With those developments it is certain that in Spain, as in France, you will very quickly, as a result of this tactic of the People's Front and the successful struggle of the People's Front, have a unified trade union movement many times stronger than was the movement before. In Spain there is unification of the youth movement. Prior to the present period there was a Socialist young people's movement, a Communist young people's movement. And today those two movements, the Young People's Socialist League, the Young Communist League, have been completely merged into one unified revolutionary youth organization. And that revolutionary youth organization, which adheres to the program of the Young Communist International, has dedicated itself to the continued fight in Spain, not only for the principles of the People's Front, but for a unified revolutionary party of the whole working class. Let me add further that the united youth organization has more than doubled the membership of the previous youth organizations, today having a membership of 140,000 revolutionary young people.

This development among the youth is not an isolated development. In the Socialist Party the decisive section of the Party membership accepts the leadership of the heroic Left Socialist leader, Caballero, who is working together with the Communists in furthering the development of a broad revolutionary people's movement and who is doing his share in the actual revolutionary struggles that are being waged today. This group undoubtedly has the support of the majority of the Socialists of Spain, and this group, following or accepting the policies that actuated the Left Socialist youth movement, likewise advocates one united revolutionary party of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers in Spain, adhering to the fundamental revolutionary principles of Socialism.

That shows that in this tremendous upheaval in Spain you not only have the coming together of masses, but you have the development of a clear-cut revolutionary core within the mass movement which adheres to sound Marxist-Leninist principles and that is preparing in the struggles of today to rally and organize the workers for the struggle for socialism tomorrow.

THE FRUITS OF UNITY

Let me add finally in that connection that the Communist Party that initiated and fought for this policy of the People's Front has increased its membership in this last period from 20,000 to 100,000. That in itself, I think, is concrete evidence that the People's Front and this government, this Left Republican government that is supported by the Socialists and Communists, have opened the way for the working class and revolutionary peasant movement in the fight against reaction. Could the workers have been prepared for this struggle that is now going on, if those victories and those positions had not been won in the period of this last year? I am sure every comrade, if he turns this over in his mind, must acknowledge that it is through the People's Front movement that the working class movement, the revolutionary Socialist movement, has put itself in a position where it could take the leadership in building up an effective anti-fascist movement against its own enemies at home and against the enemy abroad.

There have been those who said that, well, this government showed weakness in its preparation for the revolt; that this government did not act quickly enough when the fascists were preparing the present insurrection. But this government, even though vacillating on some questions, itself opened the way for the creation of that force which is today demonstrating its ability most staunchly, heroically and effectively to defend the republic against the forces of reaction.

I refer to the fact that under the leadership of the Communists and Socialists there was built up during this period the armed and trained workers' and peasants' militia which has borne the brunt of the struggle against the fascists. The organized workers' and peasants' militia enabled the Socialists and Communists and the working class movement as a whole to exercise a much more decisive role in pushing the government as such into decisive action against the fascist forces.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is no doubt that in Spain one sees a policy that on one hand results in the broadest possible rallying of the people for the struggle against reaction, while simultaneously creating that independent working class force as represented by the coming together of the unions, the coming together of the youth, the strengthening of the united front between the Socialists and Communists, and then the building up of armed workers' and peasants' groups that could be in the forefront of the fight against the fascists and for the maintenance of democracy.

DEMOCRACY VERSUS FASCISM

This brings me to another question. As to the issues in the struggle in Spain: there have been those who said that the issue in the present struggle in Spain is the issue of fascism versus Bolshevism, or fascism versus Communism. This is the cry of every reactionary throughout the world. It is the cry of the Hearsts and the Liberty Leaguers. They are striving to build up sentiment for the fascists of Spain and they raise the bugaboo of Stalin establishing his domination in Spain. They charge that a bunch of atheists are destroying the churches, that the priests are being wiped out by the thousands. They are showing in this situation the same skill in manufacturing atrocity stories and all sorts of non-existent dangers that they demonstrated when they wanted to whip up sentiment for America's entry into the World War in 1917.

But all the issues that they raise are fake issues. In Spain it is certainly not the government, it is certainly not the Socialists or Communists who are placing public order in jeopardy. It is not the anti-fascists who are creating disturbances in the country. So far as order is concerned, the government won its election victory by a popular democratic poll. And on the basis of that election victory and on the basis of the program specifically supported by the people, the government was proceeding to put into life that which the people asked for. It was the fascists who undertook to bring on chaos, to throw cities into disorder, to bring on civil war, to destroy and destroy. It was not the government, it was not the Socialists, it was not the Communists; it was precisely these people who invariably prate about law and order who were the first ones to break it whenever it interfered with their own economic and political interests.

The issue in Spain today is the issue of democracy versus fascism. The issue in Spain is the issue of peace versus war. The fascists are undertaking to overthrow democratic procedure, to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

institute a fascist dictatorship with all the terror, the persecution and the social and political reaction which Hitler has taught them. At the same time by their policies they are every day provoking a world war that will cost the lives of millions of the world's people, if they are permitted to go through with their plans.

So far as the charges of Hearst and Hitler against the Communists are concerned, the Communists of Spain have answered very clearly. *Mundo Obrero*, in an official statement of the Party, had the following to say:

> "The entire world should know that the Spanish people are fighting under the direction of the government in defense of their republic and of democracy against counter-revolutionary anarchism and fascism. It is not true that Communism has been established in Spain. It is also not true that horrors are being commited in cities under government control. The republic respects private property of friends of the republic and individual rights of all republicans. Confiscation is carried out only against those who have unleashed this terrible slaughter. They are security measures against enemies of the people. We respect and guarantee the security of foreigners and of foreign properties."

The declaration has been borne out by dozens of reports even from bourgeois correspondents in Spain. It brands the Hearsts, the Hitlers, the Mussolinis, etc., as fakers and liars, who raise false issues to conceal their intervention in behalf of the Spanish fascists.

TROTSKYITE PROVOCATION

Unfortunately there are those in the working class movement who play directly into the hands of the Hearsts and the reactionaries by themselves raising such issues as that. There are those among the Socialists, influenced by the counter-revolutionary Trotskyites, who are allying themselves with fascism, with reaction, by urging the destruction of the People's Front.

The Trotskyites, who from the outset have battled against the People's Front in France and in Spain, and who have carried their poisonous position into the Socialist Party, are attempting to make the Socialist workers believe that the issue at the moment in Spain is the issue of capitalism versus socialism.

With such a position as that you play into the hands of all of the reactionary enemies of the Spanish people. Moreover, if it were to be accepted by the Spanish workers, it would mean narrowing down the whole people's revolutionary movement. It would mean driving away every person who is ready honestly and militantly, heroically, to carry on the fight against fascism, but who is not

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yet convinced that the job before the Spanish people is the proletarian revolution, that the way out for Spain is already the institution of a proletarian dictatorship and the undertaking of the construction of socialism. Today the job before the Spanish workers is the job of defeating, and decisively defeating, reaction and feudalism.

SUPPORT THE PEOPLE'S FRONT AND THE SPANISH GOVERNMENT

And in order to defeat reaction and fascism it is the job of the most conscious sections of the working class movement, the Socialists and the Communists, to pursue such a policy as will enable them to unite around themselves every honest Republican in Spain who is against a fascist dictatorship. In fact, unless such broad democratic alliance for completing the aims of a bourgeois democratic revolution is continued, the people of Spain could not be victorious, the fascists would win. And with the victory of fascism in Spain we know from the experiences of Germany, of Austria and Italy that the job then of going forward with the building of our socialist movement and with the revolutionary struggle for our socialist objective would become a thousand times more difficult.

So we see with revolutionary realism based on the teachings of Marx and Lenin that we cannot impatiently and over-ambitiously try to jump over the concrete problems existing in Spain today. We see that the job in Spain today is to defeat fascism; it is to maintain democracy in order that the working class movement can further consolidate its position, can further strengthen its alliance with the peasantry, can further prepare the way for that time when the working class as a class, backed by firm allies among the peasantry and the middle class, can go forward to proletarian dictatorship and to a socialist society.

That is the objective and the course that is being followed in Spain today. It is a course that will lead through a fight for the maintenance of democracy against fascism, for the republic, to the unleashing of all of those forces that can one day, and soon, bring a socialist victory to the toiling masses of Spain. But that victory can only be won provided the tactics of the working class movement are the tactics that are today being followed unitedly by the Communists and Left Socialists, provided the government now wins the immediate victory that is needed in the battle against reaction.

FASCIST INTERVENTION MUST BE DEFEATED

I say that by way of discussing the inner situation in Spain itself. But I would say that we have a job of immediate and very

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great importance. And here, comrades, let me tell you that our job is not one that can be solved over a coffee cup in a restaurant, discussing whether or not the Azana Government acted a little too slowly or a little too hesitatingly. And it can't be solved if we settle down to the same coffee cup and abstractly discuss whether or not the Socialists and Communists are making the most of their present situation and out of the People's Front that has been created. I know that we have some who would like to aid the Spanish revolution in such a manner. But our job is a much more serious one and one that must be carried on by much more decisive methods. Our job centers around the fundamental issue in the conflict, namely, the danger of continued and even more direct intervention by fascist Germany and by Italy. The fascist rulers of those nations must be made by a worldwide movement to keep their hands off Spain and to withdraw their support from the Spanish fascists who are undertaking to destroy the regularly constituted government of Spain. It is our job to rally a crushing sentiment against Hitler, against Mussolini, against their policies. We have demonstrated in the fight for the protection of our heroic comrades in Germany, Thaelmann and many others, that a mass protest movement on a world scale can have decisive effects in staying the hand of these fascist executioners. And it is our job now to bring into existence such a movement here, a movement that will reflect the united protests of Communists and Socialists, of trade unionists, of middle class groups, of every opponent of fascism and of war in order to compel Mussolini and Hitler to stop their intervention in behalf of the Spanish fascists.

U. S. GOVERNMENT SHOULD SUPPORT PEACE FORCES

At the present time the United States government has a policy that has expressed itself in declarations for an abstract neutrality. Well, that kind of neutrality in a situation like the present, where the fascists are already in, where Hitler and Mussolini are shipping bombing planes and ammunition, is the kind of indifference and passivity that play into the hands of the fascists. That disarms us in the face of a developing war situation that would inevitably involve the United States when it broke.

In fact, President Roosevelt, in his speech in Chautauqua the other night, quite frankly acknowledged that in the event of an outbreak of war American neutrality policies would undoubtedly be ineffective. He felt uneasy over the fact that there would be most powerful forces here that would try to push the United States into such a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war. Having admitted that, how then can the Government rely on a neutrality policy that admittedly is not going to keep us out of war? The fascists are instigating a war into which we will inevitably be drawn and while everything is being done by them to provoke war we stand to one side and say we desire to be neutral!

We say that the U. S. government, pressed by the masses of the American people, must come out decisively against fascist intervention. The U. S. government, furthermore, is duty-bound as a republic itself, as an avowed friend of the Spanish Republic, to lend its weight directly to the demand that Hitler and Mussolini must stop supplying military equipment to the fascists, that such supplies be stopped and stopped at once.

We have the example of the Blum Government in France that certainly has bent every effort during the course of the last month to get an agreement whereby all nations would refrain from sending supplies to Spain and from taking sides in the Spanish conflict. The Blum Government demonstrated its sincerity by insisting on neutrality, striving to achieve neutrality, even at a time when it was known that planes and other equipment were being sent in by the fascists. I say in criticism of the American Government and of the policies of the Roosevelt administration, that if it had supported the efforts of France to bring about such an agreement, possibly something could have been accomplished. But now we say, when it is quite clear that these fascist nations do not intend to be kept out, then certainly the United States must be prepared to lend its support to the Soviet Union, to France and to those nations whose policies are directed towards preserving peace.

It is particularly necessary for us to take up that fight here and to take it up aggressively at the present time because, as Roosevelt acknowledged, we have reactionary forces here who are in no sense for neutrality or for a policy of isolation. We have forces here who are advocating America's entrance into this present war situation and not on the side of the forces of progress and democracy, but on the side of fascist reaction.

William Randolph Hearst, in an open letter addressed to an Australian editor, urged Great Britain to break off all relations with France. He charged that Communism already existed in France with an alliance with Bolshevik Russia and ended up by urging that the United States and England definitely take their stand on the side of the reactionary nations of the world. With Hearst fighting for such policies, with Hearst at this very moment on his way to Europe to confer with Hitler and Mussolini, Roosevelt can well recognize that there are forces here that will strive to bring America

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in on the reactionary side in Spain and on the side of world fascism. With Hearst carrying on such policies, we know that his hand-picked puppets, Landon and Knox of the Republican Party, will carry through such a policy if they come into power this year.

ALL SUPPORT TO THE SPANISH GOVERNMENT AND THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

Finally, there must be the greatest material support for the Spanish workers. The campaign launched by the I.L.G.W.U., the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the International Furriers Union, has blazed the way. They have been given support by the Communist Party, they have been supported by the *Daily Worker* in the appeals that we are now making for funds for Spain. This material support must be given and given unstintingly if we are going to play our full part in aiding our Spanish comrades in their struggle.

But along with this material support given by unions and workers' clubs, it is necessary for those same unions and the whole working class movement to join in building up mass protest movements here. These must serve notice to the fascists through a storm of resolutions that the temper of the American people is not such that they will tolerate continual challenges to world peace and to the democratic forces in Spain, France and other nations. We say now that it is the job of the whole working class movement to build up a great, powerful protest against fascism, and at the same time a movement that can break the blockade that has been set up against the Spanish government. It is necessary to open the door so that a regularly constituted government, democratically elected by the people, can get all the things it needs to defend the people and to carry out its program.

I urge all of the comrades here, the comrades of the Communist Party, of the Socialist Party, of the unions, every person here who abhors what the fascists are doing in Spain to acquaint yourselves as thoroughly as you can with the issues confronting the masses of the people in Spain. Make out of yourselves active propagandists, fighting in your own way the battle of the Spanish government. the battle of the Spanish people.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A. F. of L. Unity Is Threatened by the Executive Council

By LOUIS F. BUDENZ

ORGANIZATION of America's unorganized millions—blocked for so many years by the reactionaries in the leadership of the American Federation of Labor—has become in 1936 a major item of action for the American trade union movement.

The five national industrial union drives, announced by the Committee for Industrial Organization, reach to the heart of the open shop in America. They are designed to carry the union banner into the steel, automobile, rubber, textile and coke processing industries. Of these, the steel campaign is now on in full career, with 150 organizers in the field. In this month of August, it has entered its "second phase", the enrollment of members into the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers. It has signalized this "second phase" by the capture of the national set-up of the company unions of the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, subsidiary of United States Steel.

If carried out fully and effectively, these C.I.O. drives will represent the largest scale operation at one time that American labor has ever engaged in, for the organization of the unorganized. In their wake, millions of workers in various other crafts and industries will be brought into the ranks of the trade unions. These drives will also stimulate other national union campaigns, such as that being undertaken by the American Federation of Hosiery Workers. They will encourage the organization efforts of progressive leadership in other unions not affiliated with the C.I.O., such as the successful steps being taken by the militant administrations of District 9 of the Brotherhood of Painters, Paperhangers and Decorators, and of the New York Furriers Joint Council.

The open-shop interests were not slow in appreciating what these drives signified, in the growth of the American labor movement. Discussion of the C.I.O. development was widespread in open-shop circles and in the journals of open-shop industries. This discussion went from the heavy, basic industries over into such light and subsidiary branches as retail trade. In an article in *Women's Wear*, the employers of this trade were assured that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the A. F. of L. could not organize them, and that the C.I.O. would not turn attention to their trade until 1938, because of its pre-occupation with the basic industries!

The Morgan-du Pont interests—which control the United States Steel Corporation, the anti-union General Motors Corporation and the pro-fascist American Liberty League—proceeded to try to head off the steel campaign. Now, as in 1919, the steel companies, led off by U. S. Steel, sought to defeat unionism by the "grant" of the basic eight-hour day and the illusory overtime pay after 48 hours of work per week. Intimidation by the companies increased. A new set of rules governing discharge appeared in the Carnegie-Illinois plants, in those of the Republic Steel Company and in other steel mills. These rules were clearly designed for the easy discharge of union men and active union sympathizers. Vigilante committees, openly announcing that they intended to use force against union organizers, sprang up; the most outstanding of these being the secret "Committee of 500", engineered by the Jones & Laughlin Company at Aliquippa, Pa.

The Morgan-du Pont interests and their open-shop allies went further than that, however. They went further than the advertisements of their American Iron and Steel Institute in more than 300 newspapers of the country, praising the "high wages" in steel and the "collective bargaining" through the company unions. They reached into the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor and through their tool, William L. Hutcheson, President of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, moved to bring about a split in the American labor movement.

It is no accident that it was Hutcheson, Chairman of the "labor committee" to support the Hearst-Republican-Liberty League ticket in the current presidential campaign, who made the motion for the "suspension" of the C.I.O. unions from the A. F. of L. Under that motion, 30 days of "grace" were given to these unions to abandon the C.I.O. and its program of the organization of the unorganized in the basic industries. It is no accident, further, that these 30 days have been utilized by the reactionary Liberty League-Hearst press, to launch a continuous and vicious attack upon the C.I.O. leaders and in support of the Green-Woll-Hutcheson machine. The New York *Herald Tribune,* Liberty League organ, and the Hearst-owned newspapers in particular, vie with each other in the growing assault upon John L. Lewis, Chairman of the C.I.O. and in praise of William Green.

These papers seek to stir up the craft union rank and file against the rank and file of the industrial unionists. They openly appeal to the craft unionists to vote for the Liberty League Landon-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Knox ticket, as a rebuke to the C.I.O. leadership. Hutcheson has encouraged such a campaign, by his own public statement to craft union members, urging them to vote for the open-shop candidate, Landon, with the cry: "A vote for Roosevelt is a vote for Lewis."

It is clear that the "suspension" order of the A. F. of L. Executive Council is helpful to the big open-shop interests in two ways: (1) In threatening a split in the American trade union movement, which would weaken labor on the economic field and interfere with the full mobilization of labor's strength behind the organization of the unorganized, and (2) In the possibilities which it offers for stirring up division and dissension politically within the ranks of the trade unions, helpful to the election of the Hearst-Liberty League-Republican presidential ticket.

The "suspension" order of the Executive Council, therefore, is nothing less than that colossal crime against the unity and growth of the labor movement which Comrades Foster and Browder branded it at the time that it took place. It is part and parcel of that program of service to reaction which led Hutcheson's carpenters' delegation to defend the union-smashing and labor-hating United States Supreme Court on the floor of the Atlantic City convention of the A. F. of L.

The charges on which the C.I.O. unions were suspended were those of "dual unionism" and "insurrection against the A. F. of L.", filed by John P. Frey, President of the Metal Trades Department as self-appointed "prosecutor". The C.I.O., in setting itself up to organize the unorganized in the basic industries through industrial unionism—the only way that they can be organized—was seeking to play havoc with the charter rights of craft unions affiliated with the A. F. of L. That was the substance of the charges.

These were absurd on their very face, and were an indication of the desperate lengths to which the Executive Council had been obliged to go.

Ten of the C.I.O. unions had been in the field for many years —all of them with charters for a long time from the A. F. of L., with the exception of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. The other two unions were the outgrowth of federal unions which had first been chartered as such by the A. F. of L. and then had become international through pressure within the A. F. of L. on the Executive Council.

The entire purpose of the C.I.O. was clearly not to hamper the craft union organizations within the A. F. of L., but rather to build them up in the wake of the sweeping drive for organization of the unorganized in the basic industries. That was clearly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

emphasized by leading spokesmen for the C.I.O., including its chairman, John L. Lewis.

The question of industrial unionism for the basic, mass production industries, moreover, was not a new subject of discussion within the labor movement. The San Francisco convention of the A. F. of L., in 1934, after thoroughly discussing the question, had gone on record unanimously for organization of the unorganized in the basic industries through industrial unionism.

That San Francisco convention found itself confronted with some 2,000 new federal labor unions. The great majority of these had sprung up in the mass production industries. Facing the company unions and the gigantic combination of the industrial and financial interests in these industries, the members of these federal unions demanded charters for industrial international unions. There were thirteen resolutions for industrial unionism, expressed in one way or another, at that convention. There were two resolutions, on the other hand, asking that the federal labor unions "respect" the jurisdiction of the existing international craft unions. The chief of the latter resolutions was introduced by John P. Frey.

After extensive debate, the resolutions committee of that convention, the chairman of which was Matthew Woll and the secretary John P. Frey, brought in the resolution which recognized "the new and growing conditions with which our American labor movement is confronted".

What were these "new" conditions? The report of the resolutions committee gives them as follows:

> "During recent years there have developed new methods. This has brought about a change in the nature of the work performed by millions of workers in industries which it has been most difficult or impossible to organize into craft unions. The systems of mass production are comparatively new and are under the control of great corporations and aggregations of capital which have resisted all efforts at organization."

Therefore, Messrs. Frey and Woll, in making this report, and Messrs. Green and Hutcheson and Wharton in permitting it to be approved unanimously by the convention, recognized and endorsed the very state of affairs which the C.I.O. has stressed. They did this reluctantly, it is true, and proceeded immediately to sabotage the action of the San Francisco convention. Their admission of this condition in the mass production industries, however, knocks into a cocked hat all their "charges" of "dual unionism" against the C.I.O. for advocating the very things unanimously agreed to by the 1934 convention.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In these mass production industries, the report stressed, a movement has arisen "freeing the flood of organization sentiment existing in the breasts of millions of workers who have been prevented by employer opposition from satisfying their desire for organization".

"The American Federation of Labor is desirous of meeting this demand," the report continued. And how did it propose to do this? It declared that "craft organization is most effective in protecting the welfare and advancing the interests of the workers where the nature of the industry is such that the lines of demarcation between crafts are distinguishable."

Without stopping to debate the correctness of this statement—which is still based on the old and reformist theory that skilled workers should advance themselves at the expense of the unskilled and semi-skilled—it is noteworthy that craft organization was confined by this report to those trades where "crafts are distinguishable".

> "However, it is realized," the report went on, "that in many of the industries in which thousands of workers are employed a new condition exists requiring organization upon a different basis to be most effective."

What are these industries and what did the unanimous report adopted by the San Francisco convention propose to do about them?

> "To meet this new condition the Executive Council is directed to issue charters in the automobile, cement, aluminum and such other mass production and miscellaneous industries as in the judgment of the Executive Council may be necessary to meet the situation."

In specific industries—automobile, cement, aluminum "and such other mass production industries"—the Executive Council was thus instructed to issue international industrial union charters to the workers, organized at that time in federal labor unions.

But the resolution went further, and stated: "That the Executive Council shall at the earliest practical date inaugurate, manage, promote and conduct a campaign of organization in the iron and steel industry."

The resolution thus signaled out the steel industry as the very basis of anti-unionism in America, to the organization of which the Executive Council must devote immediate attention. Wide powers were given to the council, it will be noted, to carry out this steel unionization campaign.

"In order to protect and safeguard the members of such national and international unions as are chartered," the A. F. of L. was, for a provisional period, to designate the officers and supervise

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the affairs of the organization. It was this provision, designed on its face for the administrative "safeguarding" of the organization, which was used as the loophole by which Green and the Executive Council sabotaged the San Francisco decision.

The report was clearly a compromise, even as far as it went, as was indicated in the statement of Frey as secretary of the committee and by the answers to questions put by certain craft union officials, notably President Arthur O. Wharton of the International of Machinists. It was clear that industrial unionism was to be established in the basic industries, however, under this decision.

After some questioning, "the motion to adopt the report of the committee was carried by unanimous vote", and the convention proceedings add: "Upon which the delegates arose and applauded in an enthusiastic manner."

The delegates arose and applauded—and the Executive Council went out to sabotage the resolution which had been adopted so enthusiastically. After much hesitation, charters were given to the United Automobile Workers and to the United Rubber Workers, but these were restricted charters which hampered those organizations in their work. In the automobile union, Green imposed Francis J. Dillon, as president, who proceeded to carry out a policy of craft unionism and division, resulting in open strikebreaking in the Motor Products Corporation strike in Detroit. Charters to the radio, aluminum, cement and other unions in the basic industries were not granted. The steel campaign was never started. Worse than that, the militant upsurge of the workers in the steel industry was defeated by the tactics of the reactionary A. F. of L. leadership, aided and abetted then by the equally reactionary officials of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers.

The reactionary clique at the head of the Executive Council, as a matter of fact, utilized the time between the 1934 and 1935 conventions of the A. F. of L. to gather together their forces for the defeat of effective industrial unionism in the basic industries.

Since the trial of the C.I.O. unions this month, the Green-Woll-Hutcheson machine has sought to shift the issue. Increasing resolutions from city central bodies and local unions—especially from craft unions, protesting the "suspension" and asking for organization of the unorganized in the basic industries—have caused the reactionary clique to change its tune.

The Green-Woll-Hutcheson machine is now attempting to evade the issue of industrial unionism, in order to throw dust in the eyes of the local unions. Immediately after the "suspension" crime, William Green declared that industrial unionism for the basic indus-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tries was not the issue leading to the "trial" of the C.I.O. unions. He stated that "democracy" was at stake, and that the C.I.O. unions were seeking to impose "minority rule" on the American Federation of Labor.

At the ceremonies which accompanied the granting of the A. F. of L. charter to the American Newspaper Guild on Friday night, Green repeated the statement. He made it again at the national convention of the Hotel and Restaurant Employes International Union at Rochester, N. Y.—where it had very little effect, as the convention went on record unanimously against C.I.O. "suspension".

Such false representations of the issue are made to deceive the local unions of the country, and particularly the craft unions. Alarmed at the storm of protest against their splitting policies, the Green-Woll-Hutcheson clique is now seeking to tack and turn—and to talk of that "democracy" which they persistently fought against within the union movement for years.

It is a strange sight, indeed, to behold William Green and Matthew Woll and William L. Hutcheson weeping over the "democratic" rights of the union membership.

The facts in the case show up smashingly the hypocrisy in all this talk by Green in his new-found solicitude for "democracy". The flagrant flouting of the San Francisco decision speaks for itself. Not only was it a violation of trade union democracy; it was also a crime against the entire working class. The reports to the Atlantic City convention, page after page of them from the basic industries, show what the Executive Council did in 1934 and 1935 to interfere with organization of the unorganized and to halt the growing unions in the mass production industries.

The sabotage of the steel campaign, specifically emphasized by the 1934 resolution, constituted a particularly criminal act on the part of the council. When the steel drive actually began, it was the C.I.O. that had to inaugurate it.

The fact is that the Green-Woll-Hutcheson machine does not want to organize the steel workers. That was shown clearly by Green's statements in connection with the C.I.O. campaign, when the C.I.O. was under attack from the Iron and Steel Institute. It was also frankly admitted by John P. Frey, the self-appointed "prosecutor" of the C.I.O. unions.

This was in line with the entire record of organizational sabotage, of condoning racketeers and of denying union democracy which has marked the career of the Green-Woll-Hutcheson gang.

The issue of "democracy" in this dispute is not with the reactionary clique. It is against them—in their action in face of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

protests of local unions, city central bodies and state federations of labor. Their very "suspension" move at this time is for the purpose of defeating the democratic will of the Tampa convention in November. If the Greens, Wolls and Hutchesons are such champions of union democracy, why did they not dare to let this issue go to that Tampa convention?

Why did they "suspend" the C.I.O. unions, in flagrant violation of the A. F. of L. constitution, which says that no international union charter can be revoked except by two-thirds vote of an A. F. of L. convention?

Nor does the 18,000 to 11,000 vote at the Atlantic City convention give Green the right to talk about "democracy". Who cast those 18,000 votes? In large part, they were cast by reactionary officials who have not called conventions of their international unions for years. They had no right to speak for their membership.

Take the case of William L. Hutcheson, himself, the big boss of the Executive Council. He and his official colleagues of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners—five men—cast 2,000 votes in the Atlantic City convention for exclusive craft unionism. By what right did they cast this bloc of votes? They had none.

Hutcheson has carefully robbed the membership of the Carpenters' union of the right to speak through conventions. There has not been such a convention in his union in eight years. Now he calls one, *after* the A. F. of L. meeting at Tampa is over with—for December in Lakeland, Fla.

Does William Green call the Carpenters' situation "democracy" when he harps on that term?

When the painters' "delegation" cast a solid vote against industrial unionism, they did not speak the sentiments of their big District 9 or of many other districts within that brotherhood. Nor did the International Association of Machinists speak the views of District 1 of Philadelphia, which has gone on record squarely against the "suspension" of the C.I.O. and for the program of that organization. In Youngstown, Chicago and other centers, locals of the I. A. of M. have taken similar action.

In like manner, we could go through the list of those 18,000 votes—showing unions that have not met for national conventions for sixteen and twenty years.

Furthermore, does William Green call the splitting move of the Executive Council "democracy" in face of the protests from all sections of the labor movement?

Did not the Chicago Federation of Labor represent such a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

substantial portion of the union membership as to deserve consideration from a "democratic" Executive Council?

To that central body, speaking out against suspension, can be added among others: Philadelphia, Columbus, Ohio; Birmingham, Ala.; Newark, N. J.; Seattle, Wash.; Louisville, Ky.; Bakersfield, Calif.; Hartford, Conn.; Tampa, Fla., where the 1936 convention is to be held: Coshocton, Ohio, Green's home town; Fall River, Mass.; Akron, Ohio; Centralia, Ill. and McKeesport, Pa.

On top of that is the long list of local unions—machinists, painters, bakers, hotel and restaurant workers, and other craft bodies—in addition to the C.I.O. local unions, which have called upon the council to maintain unity.

Since the "suspension" order of August 5, the central labor bodies of Detroit, Philadelphia, Chattanooga, New Orleans, New Haven and other cities have asked for withholding of the order until the Tampa convention in November.

The San Francisco central labor body, certainly not under progressive leadership, has also requested the Executive Council not to split the labor movement.

What can unions and unionists do, at this time, to stop this undemocratic and splitting policy of the Green-Woll-Hutcheson clique?

The Central Committee of the Communist Party clearly stated the policy that will make for the building of the labor movement that should be built in this crisis. "For a United, Powerful A. F. of L.", the Party statement issued in February, emphasized the urgent need for unity in the American trade union movement—unity based on industrial unionism in the basic industries.

Confronted with the present situation, what can be done now? The following steps are of the utmost necessity—up to the end of the "period of grace" on September 5 and also beyond that time:

First, every local union can speak out for trade union unity, through reinstatement of the C.I.O. unions.

The Executive Council should be advised—particularly by the craft unions—that the splitting of the labor movement is an act of defeatism and destruction. Those protests that were made caused fear and hesitation in the Executive Council. Let them be redoubled in expression and in volume.

It is the unity of the craft unions with the industrial unions in the organizing of the unorganized that will build and advance the American trade union movement.

Second, we urge the Committee for Industrial Organization to appeal to the local craft unions, city central bodies, state federations and other labor organizations to speak out for unity.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The campaigns inaugurated by the C.I.O. will be of the greatest aid to the further building of all these unions. Certainly, the C.I.O. can gain their aid and cooperation—for the organization of the unorganized, for industrial unionism in the basic industres and for reinstatement.

Third, the Socialists in the unions have the responsibility to work vigorously for unity.

They are called upon to act with the Communists and other progressive elements in preventing the carrying through of the council's crime.

Fourth, the Communists can perform the greatest service for the labor movement at this moment.

The Communist Party stands for a united, powerful A. F. of L., dedicated to the organization of the unorganized through industrial unionism. Wherever there is a comrade in the labor movement, he is called upon to act. Upon the Districts and the Sections rests the great responsibility, in every way at their command, to rally the union forces in this fight against the expulsion of the C.I.O. unions and for their reinstatement.

It is the flood of union resolutions and union actions for reinstatement that will strike effective blows for a united labor movement.

Every tendency or effort to split central labor bodies on the C.I.O. issue or to split international unions must be opposed. Such outcomes would only play into the hands of the splitters of the labor movement, the Green-Woll-Hutcheson machine. The battle for unity on the basis of organizing the unorganized through industrial unionism has only begun in the craft unions. It must be continued effectively and in a more widespread manner.

Our comrades, and the workers everywhere, have now the great task of preserving that unity within the A. F. of L. that will rally the millions of America's unorganized to its banner and make of it a powerful instrument of the American working class.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Towards Youth Unity

By GIL GREEN

SIX months have passed since the January Conference of the Young Communist League worked out a policy for building a united youth organization to include in its ranks not only Communist, but also Socialist and non-party youth. It is now necessary to evaluate the developments and experiences of the past half year and on the basis of these to concretize further this policy and intensity the work for its realization.

In order to do this, let us briefly re-establish the general approach adopted at the time of the January Conference. The National Committee pointed out that such a united organization would be an outgrowth of activities simultaneously conducted along three specific fronts. This was stated as follows:

> "If throughout the country we can broaden and enlarge our Young Communist League, if around our Y.C.L. we can build hundreds of youth clubs and organizations of a non-party character, if at the same time we can improve our relations with the Young Socialists and gradually convince them of the need for organic unity, then, in the near future, these three channels will merge into one mighty stream."

This statement being applicable to the Y.C.L.'s of nearly all capitalist countries, the National Committee therefore made a number of other observations based on the special conditions in this country which are different from those in Europe.

In the first place, in most European countries the level of class consciousness is higher and the extent of working class political organization is far greater than in the United States. Secondly, the Socialist Youth Leagues in Europe are in most cases large organizations with great influence among decisive sections of young people.

The problem of building united youth organizations in Europe, therefore, hinges in most countries first and foremost on the question of achieving organic unity between the Communist and Socialist youth organizations. Such unity does not in itself end the process of development of these organizations, but is its first and most important prerequisite.

Let us take Spain as an example. The Socialist and Communist youth organizations decided to merge. They then followed this up by making concerted efforts towards winning Syndicalist and other

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

youth for the united organization. That they have been quite successful can be seen by the fact that while prior to merging both organizations had a combined membership of about 50,000, two months later the united organization already had 150,000 members.

In the United States, however, the Young People's Socialist League is a small organization, far weaker than even the Young Communist League. The unification of the Y.P.S.L. and Y.C.L. would not by itself lay the foundation for the mass youth organization necessary in this country, although it certainly would be a great step forward and an important incentive in that direction.

Taking these facts into consideration, the January Conference stated the following: We desire and hope to achieve organic unity with the Y.P.S.L. as soon as possible so that our united forces can proceed to reach and win the large masses of Leftward-moving youth who are as yet not identified with either the Socialist or Communist organizations. However, we at the same time recognize that in this country the problem of building a united youth organization does not hinge solely or even primarily on the question of uniting the Y.P.S.L. and Y.C.L.

This is how we posed the question at the January Conference. We were extremely careful not to work out any preconceived pattern. In fact, we stated that we "strongly warn against any attempts to work out a blueprint for this process". We did not wish to close the door to any unforseen developments. It was not yet possible to determine definitely whether organic unity between the Y.C.L. and Y.P.S.L. would be the first stage in the development of the mass youth organization, or whether the crystallization of unity among large masses of non-party youth would take place first.

We knew that the answer to this question as well as to that of the specific content, form and structure of the united organization could only arise in the course of daily struggles and as a result of practical experience. For this reason we urged the greatest flexibility in approach. While making every possible effort to bring about the unification of the Socialist and Communist youth organizations, we at the same time urged the utilization of a variety of forms and methods in organizing and uniting the masses of Leftward-moving, but politically unaffiliated young people, at the same time we urged the broadening and building of the Y.C.L. itself.

Looking back at the decisions of the January Conference, we can say that in the main they were correct. Today, however, these conclusions and decisions no longer suffice. It is necessary to concretize them, to put them in line with new developments and to thus indicate more clearly the course ahead.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First of all, we can speak more definitely regarding the perspective of organic unity between the Y.P.S.L. and the Y.C.L. We must say quite frankly that our Leagues are not to any considerable degree closer today than they were six months ago. It is true that there have been certain positive developments but on the whole these have been offset by negative ones. The positive developments are to be seen in the successful merger of the Socialist- and Communist-led student organizations and in an increase of united front actions on such issues as the American Youth Act, the fight for peace, Angelo Herndon, Spain, etc.

The negative side of the picture is to be seen in the entrance of the Trotskyists into the Y.P.S.L. and the effect of their counter-revolutionary doctrines on the policy and practice of the Y.P.S.L. This has been expressed in an increase of provocative statements about the Soviet Union and the Communist International, and in the adoption of a more narrow sectarian policy towards the mass movement in this country, in some cases even bordering on a policy of disruption —as expressed by the activities of the Y.P.S.L. at the Third American Youth Congress.

What conclusions can we draw from these facts? Certainly it would be wrong to draw the conclusion that organic unity is impossible of achievement. But it would be just as wrong to delude ourselves into believing that such a merger is just around the corner. It will take some time for the Y.P.S.L. membership to recognize and overcome the deadly Trotskyite poison circulating within the veins of their organization.

In Spain and France the Socialist Youth Leagues went through similar developments. However, because they were healthy proletarian organizations, they succeeded in ousting the Trotskyist disrupters. It is our task to help in every way to bring about the same results in this country. This can be done by developing close comradely relations with all honest Socialist youth, by organizing united actions with them on specific issues and by intensifying our ideological struggle against Trotskyism and the narrow sectarian policies of the Y.P.S.L. leadership. Within the ranks of the Y.P.S.L. one can already see a growing feeling of disgust toward the Trotskyites and of opposition toward the suicidal policies of the Y.P.S.L. leadership. Until the outcome of this struggle, organic unity is not an immediate perspective.

How do we stand in regard to the task of building and broadening the Y.C.L.? While we have accumulated certain positive experiences which have resulted in a growth of the organization, we must admit that on this score also we have hardly begun. The best ex-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

periences and the greatest steps taken in the building of the Y.C.L. were recorded in the State of New York where our League has grown to an organization of some 6,000 members. In most other states the League has no such progress to record.

Although the growth and development of the League nationally are quite uneven, it is possible to draw certain lessons from the first six months of work which are applicable nationally. First, we can say that the branch form of organization has proven itself far superior to the former small units. However, this was true only where the leading committees gave proper guidance to the branches and helped them organize both their mass work and inner life. In such cases a rapid growth was noticeable. Where such leadership was lacking the branches with their larger membership led only to greater looseness, sometimes to disorganization and sometimes even to loss of membership. Thus the central question for the branches is that of guaranteeing capable guidance and leadership for each one.

In broadening out the work of the League we must also warn against a one-sided approach. Certain comrades see the broadening of the Y.C.L. only as a problem of improving the lighter forms of activity—educational meetings, sports, socials, etc. The result of such a one-sided policy is the weakening of the mass work of the Y.C.L. in a number of places which can only result in a weakening of the Y.C.L. itself. This is true, for example, of Los Angeles. Thus we can note in a number of places a weakening of shop and trade union work, less emphasis on the struggle for Negro rights and less struggle for the immediate issues of the youth in every neighborhood.

This must be corrected if the League is to grow as the class organization of the youth. It is also necessary to say that the educational system throughout the League is still extremely weak and does not correspond with the demand for Marxist-Leninist education on the part of the membership.

The major reason for the slowness of Y.C.L. growth is the lack of attention being given by the leadership to the problems of the League at the bottom, to the functioning of the branches and to the education and training of the membership. In many Districts there is not even a conscious line towards mass recruitment.

However, this question leads to another point of great importance, a point of equal importance to that of broadening the Y.C.L. itself. While building and broadening the Y.C.L., we still face the problem of bringing together and organizing those sections of non-party youth who want a class youth organization, but who are not ready and will not join the Y.C.L.

What have been the developments among the masses of non-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party youth? These have been determined by the fact that we have entered a period of intense political ferment leading to fundamental political realignments. Large masses of people are breaking away from old political moorings and searching for and finding new ones. In the ranks of the toilers this is expressed by the growing desire for independent political action. Labor's Non-Partisan League nationally and the American Labor Party in the State of New York, are the beginnings of a breakaway by organized labor from the traditional A. F. of L. policy of so-called political neutrality. These are steps in the direction of independent political action even though hesitant and confused ones. In a number of states and localities real Farmer-Labor Parties have entered the field and a national advisory committee has been established to survey the possibilities for a national party.

At the same time the reactionary forces who have united their ranks to put over the candidacy of Landon are paying considerable attention to winning the support of young people. Not only are the channels of the Republican Party being used for this purpose, but under the inspiration of the Liberty League and Hearst the unholy trinity of Coughlin, Lemke and Gerald K. Smith is trying to ensnare the masses of youth, who are disillusioned with the two old parties, through the reactionary, semi-fascist organization of the Union Party. Smith, the self-appointed heir to the throne of Huey Long, went so far as to announce to the Townsend national convention his intentions of organizing one hundred thousand "physically fit young men" into special storm troops to fight Communism.

In this situation we must realize that the task of organizing the large masses of Leftward-moving but politically unaffiliated youth is of even greater importance than at the time of the January Conference. It is now clear that this is the main channel through which to create a strong, firm foundation for a mass youth organization. Not to see this means to leave the masses of youth who are becoming politically conscious and active but who are not yet ready to support either the Communist or Socialist Parties to the tender mercies of the reactionary demagogues.

How can we best organize the millions of youth? At the time of the January Conference we called for a variety of forms and methods. We asked our comrades in every part of the country to study carefully local developments in order to find the specific forms to be used for organizing the non-party youth. At the same time we gave a few illustrations of how to apply this policy. We pointed out to our League in Minnesota that in that state our policy implied the building and transformation of the Junior Farmer-Labor Association.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the South we discussed with our comrades the need for building a national liberation organization among the Negro youth. For California we stressed the need for reaching the youth in and around the Townsend, Epic and Utopian movements.

The result of this flexible policy was the creation of many new clubs and organizations of youth around working class programs and the strengthening of existing organizations of a progressive anti-fascist character. While the same flexible policy must apply for the future, it is possible at this time on the basis of the experiences of the past six months to indicate the link which must be used nationally in order to create the type of organization necessary in this country for the defense of the immediate interests of the youth and for their education and training in the class struggle.

This link is the movement for independent action—the movement for a Farmer-Labor Party.

Why is this so? Because the masses of toilers who are moving away from the ideology of capitalism—from the ideology of class collaboration—are breaking away from the two parties of capitalism to which they have been traditionally bound. This is the link which we must grasp because the creation of a mass Farmer-Labor Party is absolutely essential if fascism is to be defeated. The creation of this party on a national scale will mark a decisive turning point in the life of labor and the whole American people. It will mark the dawn of the new period of political awakening and growing class consciousness. For these reasons, any broad youth organization which expects to base itself on the masses of Leftward-moving youth can under present-day conditions best be built through the stream of the developing Farmer-Labor movement.

This conclusion is borne out by experience. Let us glance over the country and see what is taking place in those regions where progressive third party movements have been developing. In Minnesota a Junior Farmer-Labor Association has existed for some time and has grown in the past months. The Washington Commonwealth Federation, which is that states' step to the Farmer-Labor Party, organized a youth section in April, which has more than 500 members already and expects to have at least 6,000 by the time of its first convention in September. In North Dakota the Non-Partisan League is building its own junior organization. In Wisconsin the newly organized Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation has discussed the matter of a youth organization. There are similar developments in many local and regional Labor Party movements.

These are not isolated examples. They prove that as the Farmer-Labor Party movement develops and grows it of necessity is faced

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the problem of organizing and winning the youth. It is only logical to believe that when these scattered third party movements come together to form a national Farmer-Labor Party they will be faced with the problem of building a nation-wide youth organization.

This conclusion has great practical significance for the work of our Party and League. It means that far more attention must be given to developing mass agitation for a Farmer-Labor movement among young people. It means that we must use every local development in this direction for the organization of larger masses of youth. It means that we must convince every local Labor Party movement of the need for building youth clubs and if possible a separate youth organization in support of its platform and candidates. It means that we must call to the attention of these local parties the need for putting forth special demands which meet the needs of the youth. It means that these local parties must nominate young people as candidates.

The acceptance of this policy greatly changes the content of our agitation for a united youth organization. Instead of basing our appeal on the abstract need for a united organization, our starting point becomes the burning needs of the masses of youth. We must explain how such an organization will help defeat reaction, help improve their immediate lot and help educate them in the struggle for a new society.

We must make clear that such an organization will be "non-party" in the sense that we use that term to mean either control by the Socialist or Communist Party. It will definitely be political and "party" in the sense that it will openly support the Farmer-Labor Party.

If a Farmer-Labor youth organization is established, will there be any need for the American Youth Congress, some comrades may ask. This question can also be answered by citing our experiences. In Minnesota such an organization already exists but it does not replace the need for a movement such as the Youth Congress. In our opinion the American Youth Congress must remain non-political in the sense that it should not support one or another political party or group.

The American Youth Congress is, and should become even more so, the medium for the collaboration of existing mass organizations of youth around specific issues as embodied in the Declaration of Rights. Such collaboration must be developed regardless of the political viewpoint or affiliation of one or another of these organizations as long as these views make unity possible in behalf of the immediate interests of the great majority of youth.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The largest organizations of American youth are those not identified with any political party and any attempt to turn the Youth Congress into a Farmer-Labor youth movement would make impossible the affiliation or collaboration of these organizations with the Youth Congress.

A word is also necessary regarding future perspectives. At the January Conference we stated that we hoped the united organization could be established by 1937. It is now necessary to revise that somewhat. The fact that a national Farmer-Labor Party is not likely to be established until after the November elections makes it impractical to talk of creating a national Farmer-Labor youth organization in 1936. The point of emphasis at the moment is the building of the local and state youth organizations which will provide the foundation for a national organization following the establishment of the national party.

What is the perspective for the Y.C.L. and what will be its relations to the Farmer-Labor youth organization? In raising this question it is necessary sharply to criticize certain tendencies expressing a desire to liquidate the League which have expressed themselves in various sections of the membership. These are most sharply expressed in the state of Washington where the comrades decided that the existence of the youth section of the Washington Commonwealth Federation nullified the need for a Y.C.L. Similar tendencies are also to be found in Minnesota, Detroit, Youngstown and Toledo.

The comrades in the state of Washington leaped ahead of themselves in making their decision regarding the Y.C.L. They tried to carry through the last stage in the process of the united youth organization before the first had been completed. We believe that when the national Farmer-Labor youth organization is established the Y.C.L. should be a part of it. But the exact manner in which such unification will take place will be determined by certain conditions.

What is important to remember that we do not want just any kind of youth organization. We want an organization that will fulfil its role; an organization that will mobilize the youth for struggle in behalf of their needs and which will make possible their education in the spirit of the class struggle and socialism. This does not mean that we wish to impose our program on the broader organization. But neither does it mean that the program of that organization is of no significance to us. We certainly want to help determine that program.

Furthermore, we do not believe the youth organization will be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able to train and educate youth unless it is an independent organization. In other words, we want an organization that will base itself on the Farmer-Labor movement but not be mechanically controlled by it. We do not believe a set-up in which the youth organization has no autonomy and cannot even choose its own leadership is conducive to the proper education and training of youth. And last but not least, we believe the organization should be based on democratic principles which will permit Communist and Socialist youth to work freely, with the right to express their own views and principles inside of the united organization. Only on such conditions will it be possible to make the Farmer-Labor youth organization the united organization of the Leftward-moving youth.

The liquidation of sections of the Y.C.L. will not help in bringing about such an organization. While helping to build the local Farmer-Labor youth organization, the Y.C.L. itself must be broadened and built. A strong Y.C.L. will help build a stronger united youth organization. A strong Y.C.L. will in every stage of the development of the Farmer-Labor youth organization be able to make its position clear to the masses of youth. In its own ranks it will be able to train youth along Marxist-Leninist lines and in this way prepare a tried and experienced personnel for the youth movement.

It would be unwise at this moment to try to determine exactly the conditions under which the Farmer-Labor youth organization will be established and the exact relations of the Y.C.L. to it. We do know that this organization, if it is to become a broad mass organization, will have to be built, not alone by young Communists, but also by young Socialists, young trade unionists, and non-party youth. This is true of Minnesota and Washington and will be true to an even greater degree as the movement develops on a firmer and broader basis nationally. The views of these non-Communist youth are just as important as ours in determining the character and form of the organization. It is for this reason that only in consultation with them can the exact process of development be determined.

Let us take an example. The Y.P.S.L. at the moment is opposed to organic unity with the Y.C.L. But the Y.P.S.L. is not opposed to independent political action on the part of the American toilers and sooner or later it must take a positive attitude towards the Farmer-Labor Party movement. Could not our two organizations under such conditions get together? We could establish an arrangement whereby both of us worked to build the Farmer-Labor youth organization and when it was established affiliated to it on the basis of maintaining our own political and organizational independence. This would not be organic unity, but it would make possible the working

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

together of Socialist, Communist and non-party youth within the confines of the broader youth organization. We feel sure that under such a set-up it would not take long before we could move on to a higher stage of unification, namely, organic unity.

For this reason we must not dot our i's or cross our t's before we come to them. We must be prepared to modify or change our tactics in accordance with every changed condition. Only a strong Y.C.L. with deep roots among the youth can function in such a manner.

Our Y.C.L. through its correct mass policies has won recognition as the leading champion of the American youth and the best fighter for unity. By constantly clarifying our perspectives and tasks, by critically examining our daily work, we can, along the lines indicated above, make giant strides forward in the direction of carrying through the decisions of the Sixth Congress of the Young Communist International and of our own January Conference. The struggle for a united organization of Leftward-moving youth has only begun. Through the stream of the powerful movement for a Farmer-Labor Party it will be realized.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the Inter-American Peace Conference

By HARRISON GEORGE

HERNAN LABORDE, Secretary of our brother Communist Party of Mexico, advanced the idea at the recent Ninth Convention of the Communist Party of the United States that—"The question of the Inter-American Peace Conference should not be separated from the discussion of the present and vital problems of the Communist Party of the United States."

This "Inter-American Peace Conference", to which he referred, was initiated by President Roosevelt last January, and it has just recently been decided that it is to be held on December 1 of this year, at the city of Buenos Aires, in Argentina.

Before proceeding further with this study of the conference, it would be well to give some additional words of Comrade Laborde. He said:

> "I must call attention to the urgent necessity of liquidating the underestimation that still prevails in the Party [of the U.S.A.] on Latin American questions. It is high time, in my opinion, that it be understood that the working class of the United States has, in Latin America, 120,000,000 allies who fight for the destruction of imperialism, particularly American imperialism, and without whose active and conscious cooperation you will be unable to close the door against reaction and against warmongers, will be unable to overthrow your own bourgeoisie, and establish socialism in the United States."

This underestimation, unfortunately, has long been with us. Always it has been a mistake which we fought against but never completely abolished. Now, with the rapidity of historical developments throughout the world, we must get rid of this mistake immediately. Everywhere all our tasks must be related to the anti-imperialist struggle of the Latin American people. At the present moment the coming Inter-American Peace Conference should hold the center of our attention.

Our unity with the Latin American peoples arises from the nature of American imperialism, which not only exploits the semi-colonial countries, but American workers as well. American imperialism is not merely an abstract term. It is that term which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

identifies the handful of Wall Street bankers who exploit and oppress the 120,000,000 people of Latin America. They are the identical men who make up the Liberty League. They are the men who are backing Landon, the men who are preparing for fascism right here. In short, the term American imperialism must bring to mind, to your mind, and through you to all workers' minds, the Morgans, du Ponts, Rockefellers, Mellons and Hearsts, the fascist-minded Liberty Leaguers who seek to enslave the American people and turn Latin America into a special preserve to be looted and pillaged for their interests.

It is with this background that we must approach the tasks set before us by the Inter-American Peace Conference.

The fear of war and the desire for peace are uppermost in the minds of tens of millions in Latin America no less than in the U.S.A. All are suspicious, apprehensive. And justly so. They see Hitler arming hastily and arrogantly—and at any moment likely to plunge the world into war. They have seen fascist Italy ravage Ethiopia and go unpunished. They know that, however distant is Japan, it menaces the world with war by its invasions in China and provocations against the Soviet Union. And they have fully realized in recent days how the fascists of Spain, calling to their side the fascists of Europe, are the most ruthless and cynical of criminal war-makers.

Particularly do the Latin American peoples oppose war because they have witnessed the bloody years of war between Paraguay and Bolivia in the Gran Chaco—a war ending in mutual exhaustion and terminated only because the contending interests of British and American imperialism were threatened more by its continuation than by its end.

The common people of both North and South America have looked hopefully to all collective efforts anywhere to maintain peace, to the League of Nations and to the Soviet-French Mutual Aid Pact. Any weakness or retreat of the League has been against their wishes and taken in opposition to their demands. Its strength has been borrowed from their support. Its failures have saddened and worried them. Let Hitler and Mussolini rejoice and Hearst point gleefully to the League's failure—the masses of the people took no joy out of it.

Thus, the peoples of both the United States and Latin America will expect something from the Inter-American Peace Conference. They want new obstacles placed before the warmakers. They want some assurance that the threat of war can be pushed back, even if not out of the perspective.

Upon what basis, then, can the nations of the Americas (North,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Central and South) reach an agreement that will give even the minimum of such assurance? An agreement among these nations will be no agreement whatever unless it is based on ending the fundamental conflict over the violation of national sovereignty of Latin American nations by the United States, which tries to justify itself by the Monroe Doctrine.

The Monroe Doctrine must be renounced by the United States, in plain words, and before all the world when Secretary Hull arises to address the conference at Buenos Aires. This hoary excuse to justify U.S. intervention in the internal affairs of the Latin American countries must be thrown overboard.

Instead, a policy must be adopted which will rest upon the complete equality of all Latin American countries with the biggest American nation—the United States. There must be scrupulous observance of the national sovereignty of these small nations by the United States. In other words, there must be complete abolition of the Monroe Doctrine and, on this basis, it will be possible for the Latin American countries to work with the United States for collective security and peace in this part of the world.

The abolition of the Monroe Doctrine means that the so-called right of intervention to protect American lives and property must be given up forever. It must be plainly declared that all Latin American nations, whether they are near or far from the United States borders, have the sovereign right to govern themselves without interference by the American government. That the U.S.A. henceforth will never intervene to collect defaulted debts or impose its will by force, military or economic, upon these governments.

If the Inter-American Peace Conference is really to work for peace, it cannot take an "isolationist" attitude, nor a so-called "neutral" attitude to the rest of the world—as the Americas are inextricably a part of the world and any world war most certainly will involve them. War anywhere means war everywhere.

The announcement by Roosevelt of his "good-neighbor" policy has been taken in Latin America, by some, as indicating a break from the Monroe Doctrine, the traditional policy of the reactionaries clustered around the Republican Party. Roosevelt's words gave that implication. But it remains in practice an implication.

American capitalism, fully aware that in these days the old policy of armed intervention would rouse a tremendous anti-Wall Street feeling, seeks to conceal the hand of American imperialism in the suppression of "disorders" within any Latin American nation. It seeks to obtain the same result—the crushing of national liberation movements—by obtaining at Buenos Aires an accord making *all*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other American nations responsible in the suppression, in any one country, of such "disorders as threaten the peace and security" of its neighbors.

These are weasel words that distort the whole intent of "collective security" into a reactionary plot against the Latin American peoples. It is a travesty on the term "good neighbor". And such a policy is advocated precisely by such reactionary regimes as that of Justo in Argentina, who offered to send Argentine troops into Brazil last November to help dictator Vargas slaughter the followers of the National Liberation Alliance. Such a reactionary pact against the Latin American peoples must be opposed, and—in behalf of peace—all national liberation movements must be supported, as these are the most reliable factors for peace.

There is certainly room to work for peace in the Conference by pacts of non-aggression and mutual aid. But these must be regional, multi-lateral pacts. They must afford effective sanctions against aggressors and genuine aid to the nation attacked by an aggressor.

Such regional pacts can afford a degree of assurance of peace. But it is plain from the recent events in Spain that neither the administration formula of "neutrality" nor any pacts, however good, of regional nature between the American nations, can qualify as an insuperable obstacle to world war. The Spanish events, and the cynical hypocrisy of fascist Italy and Nazi Germany in helping the fascists, show how closely the Americas are tied up with the fate of Europe. Spain has an enormous influence in Latin America, and the line-up of the world over Spain inescapably ties each nation to one side or the other.

Hence, to keep war out of the world is a premise for keeping Latin America out of war. And the League of Nations, injured as it has been, remains the sole international body of nations that can be used for obstructing, even if weakly, the outbreak of world war. However the Hitlers may sneer, the peoples of Latin America cling to the idea of the League as such an obstacle.

If the Inter-American Peace Conference is to lend any aid to world peace, if it is not to serve the disruptive purpose of a body hostile to Geneva, it must take a stand for cooperation with the League—and with all other forces working for peace. It must support all efforts of the League to maintain peace, to punish aggressors; and it must collaborate with the Soviet Union in its peace policy—a policy that has blocked the warmakers so far in both the Far East and Europe. Any isolation of the Western Hemisphere, supposedly to keep it out of war, would weaken the col-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lective world organization of peace, would strengthen the power of Wall Street, and make possible for the American reactionaries like Hearst and the Liberty Leaguers to maneuver the whole hemisphere into war for their own interest. Thus, the Buenos Aires Conference can neither oppose nor ignore the League of Nations, but must take a stand to cooperate with it in the fight for peace.

The Republican Party and its Coughlin and Lemke satellites are bitterly opposed to the League, to any "entangling alliances", because they want to give a free hand to the fascist warmakers and block all joint action of peace forces. Roosevelt attempts his "middle ground" by "neutrality", which by no means aids peace but does tend to encourage aggressors such as Mussolini, and by this Inter-American Peace Conference which the reactionaries attack as an "entangling alliance", which may block the desire of Coughlin, Hearst and the Republican Party reactionaries to intervene with arms to "put Mexico in order"—and get Mexico's silver resources.

Should Roosevelt choose the road of yielding to reactionary pressure, it would prevent the American people from throwing their full weight to the scales on the side of peace. Therefore, it is necessary for the people to act now to demand that the United States at the Conference stand for world peace as well as peace in the Americas. This would include collaboration with all the peace powers in the world. It must include the support of all those measures of the League of Nations which tend to preserve peace and throw obstacles in the way of the fascist war-makers. This means that the American people must bring pressure to bear on Roosevelt, to keep him from yielding to Hearst and Coughlin and try and "unite" the American countries in opposition to the League of Nations. This would be a blow against peace and would play into the hands of the most reactionary sections of Wall Street.

Of course, Roosevelt called the Inter-American Peace Conference to protect the interests of American capitalists. But at the moment the Administration stands for the status quo and the maintenance of peace. It wishes to weaken in Latin America its principal imperialist rival—Great Britain—and likewise Japan's growing place there. Its desire at the moment to avoid a war can be used to unite the United States and the Latin American countries for collective security and peace. The Administration can be made to contribute to peace by working with the Latin American countries and by agreeing to support the forces for peace throughout the world.

Another important demand of the Latin American people is the abolition of unequal treaties. It is the task of the American people to bring pressure to bear upon the Administration to compel

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it at the Buenos Aires Conference to renounce and cancel the so-called reciprocity treaties that work to the injury of Latin America and replace them with commercial treaties which put all the countries on an equal basis, treaties which do not hinder the industrial development of Latin America. The abolition of all unequal treaties must be one of the central demands at the Conference, in order to wipe out those treaties which bankrupt the small industries of Latin American countries and subordinate their whole economy to Wall Street. These unequal treaties must be removed and replaced with treaties based on equality if effective steps are to be taken to organize for collective security and peace.

The Inter-American Peace Conference can become of importance to the workers and farmers of the United States, as well as the workers and peasants in the Latin American countries. Steps can be taken which will weaken the drive of the fascist countries towards war, and in turn this will weaken the ability of the most reactionary forces in the United States to cooperate with Hitler and the other war-makers. Effective steps toward peace will strengthen the power of the workers and farmers in the United States to battle against the reactionary concentration in the Liberty League and the Republican Party.

Therefore the active support of American workers and farmers is needed to exert every pressure upon the Roosevelt Administration to adopt a real peace policy at Buenos Aires; to compel the United States representatives there to take a position in agreement with the demands of Latin American peoples to weaken the power of Wall Street in Latin America—a result that in itself would be a great aid to peace.

The American people, of course, while giving aid to and driving toward furtherance of every anti-imperialist and peace proposal inside the Inter-American Peace Conference, should by no means limit its action to that. The actions of the American workers and farmers, the trade unions and Farmer-Labor Party groups and movements, must support every national liberation movement and force for peace that exists in Latin America.

The Mexican Confederation of Workers proposed on July 5 that the popular masses of Latin American countries be given representation, along with the official government delegates, at the coming Buenos Aires Conference. Under the circumstances prevailing in Mexico this proposal is correct and the people of the United States can well support such collateral delegations, and their struggle in the Conference for peace.

Coincidentally, a prominent Argentine Socialist leader, Doctor

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alicia Moreau de Justo, has proposed that a "People's Peace Conference" be held in Buenos Aires, a few days before the opening of the Inter-American Peace Conference on December 1. Invitations have been sent to a great number of peace, cultural, student, labor and other organizations in Latin America, and to the People's Mandate Commitee in Washington.

The proposed agenda for this People's Peace Conference is: "Maintenance of the status quo in armaments; the gradual establishment of free exchange between the countries of the American continent; and the unhindered circulation of ideas."

This agenda is, as can be seen, a most modest outline of what the peoples of Latin America might aspire to gain from the Inter-American Peace Conference, upon which the People's Peace Conference could be expected to exert pressure.

These modest suggestions, however, have exited the enemies of peace. Already in July, the governing board of the Pan-American Union, that organization of the Monroe Doctrine, struck off the draft program of the Conference two highly important questions: (1) The civil rights of women; and, (2) the welfare of workers. And it was stated:

> "Preferential consideration be given by the conference to questions relating to the organization of peace, and that the conference determine which of the other topics, whether of an economic, commercial or cultural character, are sufficiently ripe or merit a sufficiently general consensus of approval to make advisable their consideration by the conference."

The rights of women, so long held back in Latin America, are a factor in the fight for peace, as women are the enemies of war. And the "topics of commercial character"—in the line of the "reciprocity treaties"—are most fundamental. All these matters require the earnest attention of our Party and of the entire working class of the U.S.A.

There can be much gained for peace by the action and intervention of the masses of people, both here and in Latin America, in the Buenos Aires Peace Conference. But the American people cannot allow it to be left to Roosevelt and the American government delegation. A continuous bombardment of demands must pour in from the American people demanding a real peace conference:

1. Abolition of the Monroe Doctrine;
2. Commercial treaties on a basis of equality that will not subject Latin American countries to U. S. domination and an abrogation of the "reciprocity treaties";
3. Regional multi-lateral pacts of non-aggression and mutual

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aid of effective nature, with all cooperation to peace efforts of the League of Nations and the Soviet Union.

And, aside from this pressure upon the American government, a campaign to build the alliance between the national liberation movement of Latin American countries and the exploited masses of the United States, in the fight for maintaining peace in this hemisphere and in the world.

Every support to the Argentine proposal for a People's Peace Conference a few days prior to the official conference; with an agenda which shall more adequately express the requirements of peace and more definitely influence the official conference to conform with the desires and the needs of the masses of all America.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Housing Question

By E. C. GREENFIELD

THE HOUSING SHORTAGE ACCORDING TO ENGELS

THE present housing situation is nothing new. The "housing shortage" has always been a sore spot in capitalist society. Engels pointed out in 1872 that the "housing shortage" brought forth all manner of quackery and reforms. A "housing shortage" of large-scale proportion had developed in Europe that had penetrated even to the upper strata of the middle class. The shortage of houses came at a time when the transition from manufacture and small-scale production to large-scale industry was taking place. Engels wrote at that time as follows:

> "On the one hand masses of rural workers are suddenly drawn into big towns, which develop into industrial centers; on the other hand the building plans of these old towns do not any longer conform with the conditions of new large-scale industry and the corresponding traffic; streets are widened and new ones cut through, and railroads run through the center of the town. At the very time when masses of workers are streaming into the towns, workers' dwellings are pulled down on a large scale. Hence the sudden housing shortage for workers. . . ."

American company-owned towns with all their evil housing conditions find their similarities in Engels' times when the whole philosophy of factory-owned homes developed out of the capitalists' idea of housing workers, borrowed largely from Proudhon.

In developing his polemics against Dr. Sax, a contemporary of his, Engels further points out:

> "The big rural factory-owners particularly in England have long ago recognized that the building of workers' homes is not only a necessity, a part of the factory equipment itself, but also that it pays well. In England whole villages have grown up in this way and some of them later developed into towns. The workers, however, instead of being thankful to their philanthropic capitalists, have always raised considerable objection to their 'cottage system'. Not only are they compelled to pay monopoly prices for these houses because there is no competition, but, immediately a strike breaks out, they are homeless because the factory-owner without any more ado throws them out of his houses and thus renders resistance difficult."

Thus we see at the present time the need for a sharper fight

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against foreclosures and evictions as a weapon to assist the workers to win their economic demands. When workers are faced with a loss of their lifetime savings invested in their homes, they are more easily tempted to take what is offered to them in the way of wages.

AMERICA'S BOOM PERIOD OF AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTION

In the last few decades we have been brought face to face with the realization of what Engels was discussing. To be sure, it was always part of America's development. (A. Bimba, *The History of the American Working Class.*) Since the development and rapid rise of the automotive industry we have seen classic examples of these phenomena in boom towns like Detroit, Cleveland, Toledo. The underlying causes pointed out by Engels hold good for the large-scale real estate land developments and housing shortages of today.

Take Detroit, for example. When the upsurge in mass production of automobiles got in full swing, old narrow streets were widened to take care of the tremendous automobile traffic. The workers were forced by a sudden shortage of homes to buy houses and lots farther in the outskirts. These were built and owned by the automotive giants and bankers. Cleveland had a more gradual development; nevertheless, its boom periods developed identical conditions.

The "housing shortage" today takes place in the decay of capitalism when large real estate developments have collapsed and there are taking place mass foreclosures and evictions.

Ever since the "Florida Real Estate Bust", the real estate situation throughout the country has been such that it has wiped out the savings of millions of small property-owners. The Florida Fiasco marked the beginning of the long downward spiral of real estate values. Some time before the stock market crash, building houses ceased as a family venture and as a business. For years unpaid special assessments and taxes have been piling up on building allotments all over the country and they still remain unpaid.

Year after year, the accumulated debt has risen so high that the debts exceed the value of the lots. This, coupled with the tremendous bond investment required to improve all this property, is reducing cities and townships to actual bankruptcy. One need go no further than Brooklyn, a suburb of Cleveland, for an example of how the draining of the entire tax resources to pay off bonded indebtedness has endangered the health and safety of the entire community by bankrupting it. Today, in the outskirts of our cities, we see miles of paved streets, graded parkways, ornamental lighting systems, sidewalks and fireplugs, in fact every improvement is on these lots with the exception of homes to live in.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CREATING ARTIFICIAL SHORTAGE OF HOMES

Let us examine a little more in detail the existing housing shortage as it applies directly to the Cleveland metropolitan area. According to the *Real Property Inventory*, published by Howard Whipple Green for 1935, the number of vacant family units has decreased from 9 per cent in 1932 to 3 per cent in 1935, a 33 1/3 per cent decrease in three years. This 3 per cent vacancy totals 9,765 units as against a 9 per cent totaling approximately 29,000 units vacant in 1932.

Question: What caused this rapid decrease in the number of vacancies? Nineteen-thirty-two marked the peak of dwelling foreclosures immediately following the crash of 1929, although they had been steadily on the increase since 1926, in 1930 it reached a record high of 5,000. In 1932 there were nearly 3,000 homes foreclosed. This immediately caused a large doubling up of families. This, coupled with the great amount of tenants who could no longer pay rent and were evicted, created a total of 12,642 extra families in 1932.

This particular economic condition of the masses caused by unemployment is the basic reason for the 29,000 vacant dwelling units.

These figures shed a great deal of light on why the strength of the Small Home and Land Owners Federation was so great in the year of 1933 and they also have a great deal of bearing on why the Home Owners Loan Corporation immediately started pouring liquid assets into the defunct banks that were stuck with this property.

HOW THE HOME LOAN REDUCED THESE VACANCIES

Well over 30,000 home loans were issued in the metropolitan district of Cleveland since 1933, which had a great deal of bearing on the undoubling of these 12,000 extra families pointed out before.

The next process in ridding the city of vacancies in dwellings was the outright demolishing of homes, which has caused an undue amount of suffering and misery, particularly on the Negro population of this city, where most of the so-called slum clearing projects are in operation.

Figures show, according to Howard Whipple Green, that 3,004 family units have been demolished since 1932 and up until October, 1935. Of these, 1,369 were demolished in 1935. Six hundred and six of these demolished family units in 1935 were demolished to make way for slum housing. These slum housing projects are in districts of densely populated Negro sections. "Cedar", "Central", "Outhwaite" and the "West Side" housing project areas are all located in these Negro districts. These families, forced to move elsewhere, have simply

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been forced back, so to speak, into the adjacent neighborhoods surrounding the projects. The adjacent territories are composed largely of very old tenements and dwellings as dilapidated and unfit for human habitation as the ones that have been torn down.

This intense over-crowding has virtually turned entire districts into rows of disease-breeding houses and fire-traps. The cremation of a Negro mother and child in one of these fire-traps on East 55th Street, closely adjacent to the Outhwaite slum project, is only an indication of the fire hazard that exists in these over-crowded sections, caused by the slum clearances. And—all of this is done in the effort to create an intense housing shortage, to boost rents and to increase real estate property value now in the hands of the bankers.

In 1931 the banks were bankrupt, their assets frozen. Through the "Home Loan" set-up they received over $4,000,000,000, allowing them to liquidate thousands of mortgages on a refinancing basis which makes the home-owners pay double, and the banks to make more profit. This was augmented by direct loans to the bankers from the R.F.C. Next came the Federal Housing Act which loans money to those who can qualify to build homes. These loans are based upon a very high interest rate.

With all of these schemes the banks are still unable to stimulate an increase in home building. The allotments are still lying idle and piling up debt. If a shortage of homes is to be created, thousands of dwellings (according to the bankers), must now be demolished. Therefore, slum clearance projects. This forces thousands of tenants in the slum districts to seek quarters somewhere within their means in other sections of the city. This will quickly create a new slum area and drive those who can afford it in the invaded neighborhood, to seek homes elsewhere.

Although there has been a great deal of ballyhoo concerning how these slum clearing projects will eventually bring forth dwellings in low rent brackets, *it will be some time before tenants can live in them.*

FARM FORECLOSURES WILL INCREASE URBAN HOME SHORTAGE

Although some attempts by government loan agencies and other manner of farm relief have been made to ease up the farm situation with respect to foreclosures, the small farmer is being converted from one who owned and worked his own farm to one who must either work as a farmer for wages or seek other employment in urban centers.

Reports from all over the country show that foreclosures are on the increase. One Western Congressman states that 3,000,000 people, including masses of farmers, will lose their homes in 1936. In Cleve-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land, 20,249 dwellings were foreclosed since 1926. This means that a great many farmers will be driven from their land and forced to find cheap dwellings in the more urban districts. The urban dwellers are also losing their homes by the thousands, lowering the standards of living and forcing them into lower class neighborhoods.

Aiding this artificial shortage is the banker's brutal stand taken through his rental policy. He refuses to rent homes to any tenant who cannot show paid-up receipts for the past year. *The foreclosed home-owner has no credit standing at all.*

In every section of the city you will notice homes that have been vacated. They are either in dilapidated and deteriorated condition or boarded up by the bankers. The result is that an actual shortage of dwellings exists even now.

This artificial creation of the housing shortage is driving the small savings and loan associations, whose investments are mainly tied up in real estate involving inhabitable homes, to cry out to the high heavens. A document published by the Atlas Savings and Loan Company (one of the larger savings and loan associations) states:

> "We, therefore, find ourselves today with unpaid deposits of $2,200,000 in real estate." They further state, "due to the great amount of property on sale in this country, acquired by other financial institutions through foreclosure proceedings, it is exceedingly difficult to interest persons in the purchase thereof." They sum up the situation as follows: "As long as the company is compelled to carry this amount of real estate, further cash distribution will be almost impossible."

The policy of the real estate speculators today is through government subsidies to finance the building of homes on their long idle and debt-burdened allotments and to sell these to strata of the middle class, skilled and technical workers who are still in better circumstances.

In 1933, facts and figures show that the working class and lower strata of the middle class by a large majority were more rigidly tied to the land than perhaps in any other country. Let us examine the following figures set forth by the Central United National Bank:

Valuation of Non-Farm Homes

1933

Number of non-farm homes in the United States	10,503,386
Valuation	*Number of Homes*
$1,999.00 or less	1,896,048
$2,000.00 to $2,999.00	1,167,325
$3,000.00 to $4,999.00	2,343,769
Total Homes Below $5,000 Valuation	
The average bracket of working class homes	5,407,142

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This means that nearly 5,500,000 families, totaling over 20,000,000 people, in the working class brackets were home-owners in 1933.

Middle Class Strata

$5,000.00 to $7,499.00	2,297,029
$7,500.00 to $9,999.00	989,468
Total homes between $5,000 and $10,000 valuation	3,286,497

This means that over 3,250,000 families of the ordinary middle class, totaling over 13,000,000 people, were also home-owners in 1933. We can conservatively estimate that 34,774,556 people under these two classifications are what Engels termed "tied to the land", not in the same manner as farmers but ideologically as owners of private property.

Speculative land booms following in the wake of the industrial development of America have produced among the workers and middle class the largest individual home-owning population perhaps in the world. Out of an estimated 27,500,000 families in America, 10,503,386 of them, besides the farming population, are individual home-owners in the United States. Of these 10,503,386 urban home-owners, 8,693,639 are middle class and working class families.

When we compute the millions of foreclosures that have taken place during the crisis and will take place in the next few short months throughout the country, we can see we have reached that stage in capitalism where the farmer and ruban property-owners are being virtually jerked out by the roots from the land and property they have been ideologically and economically tied to. We have seen in the farm revolts in the West and the militant uprising of the small home-owners in the cities, the transformation Engels speaks of—when the most stable and conservative population is turned into a "revolutionary hotbed"—but this "revolutionary hotbed", in its political confusion, can be organized by the Hearsts and the Liberty League reactionaries into fascist bands of reaction unless the Communist Party can develop a very concrete program that will lead these disillusioned small property-owners step by step until they are convinced, as Engels put it, "that the solution lies only in the expropriation of the present owners through the seizure of political power by the proletariat".

An examination of what has been done to organize this section of the people can be summed up as follows:

1. Movements among the farmers against foreclosures, developing penny sales and eviction struggles. Also movements to boost, by farmer strikes, the price to the farmer for his products.

2. Movements among the urban small property-owners against

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

high taxes, eviction and foreclosure. For lower interest rates, water rates and other utility rates. A more or less general moratorium demand for both farmer and urban dwellers. In the main, most of the real action developed into struggles against evictions.

In Cleveland there has been a more steady and stable movement than elsewhere among the urban home-owners. The Small Home and Land Owners Federation is still a vital active force in the struggle against foreclosure and evictions. In Cleveland concessions are still being won and the issues are still sharp, but on the whole the movement is slowing down.

Again I must draw to your attention that the home-owners are going through a wearing-down process of struggle and, until we are successful in breaking down their illusions concerning recovery and jobs, we are not going to see any great broad movement in this field, although there will be sporadic struggles of mass proportions around certain cases. To hold this movement together and strengthen it must be a task that the Party cannot neglect. Although the home-owners have narrowed down considerably they are and will remain an organized force in the movement. How it is broadened will be determined on how we, as Communists, tackle the problem.

There are other more economic factors that also tend to narrow down the movement and it is with these factors we have to deal primarily if we are to organize home-owners on a large mass scale.

1. Many home-owners are not anxious to struggle for their homes because they are simply disgusted with trying to keep them. They see no advantage of struggling against eviction only to gain as a reward a long period of indebtedness that in the end they are afraid they cannot meet.

2. Those that still have fair incomes but not enough to keep their highly inflated mortgage paid up figure very correctly that they can buy as good a place at present much cheaper and thereby lower their payments and debt and also get out of the higher tax districts.

Of course, when large numbers of home-owners start leaving "better" neighborhoods for cheaper neighborhoods it will start crowding the cheaper neighborhoods, resulting in more foreclosures against the delinquents to supply the demand, again intensifying the "housing shortage".

There will also be those who will want to try solving the housing question by accepting the present government scheme of Federal Housing Administration. (F.H.A.)

The F.H.A. loans money through the banks and not directly to the prospective builder, providing he can furnish the lot to build on. The interest rate, although placed at 5 per cent, by the time carrying

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

charges, insurance, etc., are added becomes around 9 per cent.

Other restrictions, such as a guaranteed income sufficiently high to exclude working class people, give a direct play to the upper middle class who are now being economically pressed. Plans for homes that will cost from $1,700 up to build are being worked out by the government. In this district they are planning on 20,000 deals of this nature. Already papers are carrying stories of "housing shortages", publicizing the F.H.A. This whole set-up is one to relieve, at the expense of the masses, the big bankers who are swamped with developed real estate allotments.

THE BANKERS' WAY OUT

The bankers' way out of this dilemma is to increase the taxes of the poor to make up the bankers' tax delinquency—to create an artificial shortage of homes in order to create demand for their debt-ridden allotments—to make even the taxpayers pay through the government subsidies to finance their housing schemes.

The people of Cleveland have just had another tax raise foisted upon them in the "seven mill levy". This saved the situation temporarily for the bankers in Cleveland. How temporary this arrangement is, is demonstrated by Councilman Artl's proposal to lift another million out of the pockets of the people for fire apparatus. With all of this the tax delinquency has increased 900 per cent in the last decade and the city indebtedness has increased 360 per cent. As the tax delinquency increases, the bankers, through their control of tax commissions, continue to raise the tax rate on small property-owners, in order to secure the interest payments on their bonds.

All of these housing schemes are going to intensify the misery of the working class home-owner and tenant. Rents will go higher. They are already on the increase. Working class home-owners will face more foreclosures and evictions. For—it will be in these sections comprising the $4,000 and less valuations that will attract the "diminishing" middle classes as they try to recuperate their economic condition, thus forcing the mortgage-holders who want to again make profit on their holdings, to take the houses out of the hands of those who can no longer pay and sell or rent them to people in better circumstances.

We are confronted with a new development in "housing shortage". A "housing shortage" of a different character than heretofore.

Heretofore, housing shortages were the natural consequence of expanding large-scale industry under capitalist society. Now we face a housing shortage created by legal means to help bolster decaying

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitalism. Real estate development of the old character has reached its peak. From now on America's great mass of urban home-owners will become fewer in number. It is in this phase of capitalist society that we can best and quite properly put forth a program of housing for tenants and present home-owners.

We must organize these working class and lower middle class urban home-owners around a housing program at the expense of the rich and in the interests of the poor.

Toward such a program I will present the following proposals:

1. A more intensive drive to stop foreclosures and evictions.
2. Lower taxes on the small urban home-owner.
3. Lower rents for tenants.
4. A more intense educational program to bring out the true character of this housing crisis. This educational campaign to be conducted on the radio and developed into a housing program of a wide nature.

It is Point 4 that I wish to develop in more detail in this document.

A HOUSING PROGRAM

Capitalist society can never again enter into that boom period where gigantic enterprise of private housing plans can be initiated. There will be no more vast real estate developments based on the investment of private capital because: Gigantic industrial expansion that must be the forerunner of large-scale real estate development cannot take place in a depression of a "special kind" spoken of in the *Open Letter*. From now on the government will have to take a hand in the housing question. The R.F.C., F.H.A. and H.O.L.C. are all only indications of further moves in this direction. This means that the housing situation, regardless of anyone's feelings in the matter, goes into a much higher phase of politics.

If we do not take a hand and bring forth a housing program, we can be sure the fascist-minded Hearsts and Liberty Leaguers will. Huey Long was close to such a thing in his "Every Man a King" idea.

SUMMARY AND PROGRAM

Cleveland papers say that Cuyahoga County is in need of 20,000 new homes and they talk about a government financing scheme to help provide them. On the surface this looks as if the government is actually trying to solve the housing shortage, but when we examine their plans and schemes as outlined in this document they are simply intensifying the housing situation by creating more taxes, by over-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crowding, by the outright destruction of dwellings and increasing of foreclosures and evictions to make way for a building program to enrich the bankers and the land sharks. The government's present housing plan will in no way solve the housing question for the unemployed or for those who have their incomes driven down to an extremely low standard of living.

The program for the home-owners and tenants should be one that demands: *Low-priced homes and rentals, not high taxes and high rents.* If the municipal government would foreclose the "tax default" real estate allotments and take in exchange land for the debt, the government could build decent habitable dwellings for the benefit of those impoverished through the crisis.

There are 8,851 families in Cleveland living either with their families or friends and according to Howard Whipple Green this is a very conservative figure. There are over 9,000 vacant dwellings in Cleveland. We should demand homes, not crowding and congestion.

Foreclosures on dwellings increased over 100 per cent since 1934. We should demand cheap government loans and no foreclosures.

The government has been unable to solve the unemployment question, therefore we should demand jobs for the youth and adequate unemployment insurance and old-age pensions for the unemployed.

PROGRAM

1. Low-priced homes and rentals, not high taxes and high rent.
2. Do away with dangerous overcrowding and congestion.
3. Cheap government loans, not foreclosures, a moratorium on all H.O.L.C. loans for those unable to pay.
4. Jobs for the youth and adequate unemployment insurance and old-age pensions.
5. Support to all trade unions in their struggle for higher wages.

This simple and easily-understood five-point program would be one that could unify the various mass groupings who are fighting for some kind of economic reform. It is a united front program that, if carried forward properly, could tear the mask off the demagogy of Coughlin, Hearst and the Liberty Leaguers.

The kind of a housing program that would be acceptable to the home-owner, both of the kind who own a few renting units and the kind who own just their own homes, would be one that offered a solution to the foreclosure problem and the problem of indigent tenants.

The working class home-owner who rents his upstairs floor is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

faced with a fundamental problem when he takes a stand against foreclosure and eviction. If he organizes against the banks to stop foreclosures because he is unable to pay for reasons of unemployment or no income, he cannot consistently direct his fight against the unemployed tenant who is in the same fix. The unity of these two sections of the working class is impossible as long as the small home-owner is forced to carry the burden of housing the unemployed. The home-owner relies to a certain extent, if he is the owner of a double house or other extra properties, upon rents to carry the overhead of taxes and mortgage payments on his property. Even though he is inclined to understand that unemployed tenants are not to blame for not paying rent he will in most cases enter into competition for that market of renters who are still able to pay rent. The home-owner has found that all efforts at trying to get rent subsidies from relief agencies are disastrous to his position as a home-owner. He cannot meet his taxes and mortgages under these conditions.

The unemployed tenant has no choice in the matter. He is forced to remain in the house as long as he possibly can because the relief agencies will take no consideration of his case until he is evicted. Therefore, any rational solution to this problem must be one that takes the entire burden of housing the unemployed off the backs of small home-owners while at the same time gives housing security to the unemployed tenant. Therefore, a housing program adjusted to this condition must be one that gives housing to the unemployed, in housing units built and maintained by the government.

Of course, a movement of this kind would have to draw upon broad masses for support if we are to go any place. In my opinion it would be a very strong basis for uniting the youth and old-age movements into the united front advancing the move for a Farmer-Labor Party which, of course, would have to be the final answer for such legislation.

However, I think now is the time to raise such an issue and start agitational work around a concrete housing program for the working class, organizing it much in the fashion that Father Coughlin did by radio propaganda. I think any housing program that the Party brings forward should be initiated by the Small Home and Land Owners Federation, the same as the Unemployment Insurance campaign was initiated by the Unemployment Councils. It is an issue we cannot afford to neglect.

In this document I have sharply pointed out a condition which, if allowed to develop and without the Party taking action to shape and guide it, will eventually be a reactionary boomerang. If these small property owners who are now being torn loose from their homes by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the development of the capitalist crisis, in their confusion fall in line with the Coughlins, Hearsts and others, they will have a base in nearly every organization in the country including the trade unions.

Approaching it from this viewpoint, a working class housing program would tie in and help cement the unity of the youth movement, the old-age pension and social insurance movements and the trade unions.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Rule in South Africa

By WILLIAM L. PATTERSON

WITH the tide of anti-imperialist and national liberation struggles rising ever higher, it is of importance to analyze British rule of South Africa, first for the lessons it will teach us in anti-imperialist struggle, and secondly because Africa is now the center of world attention as the fascist powers hungrily turn their eyes toward this continent with the object of capturing more spoils. Mr. George Padmore has just writen a book on *How Britain Rules Africa* in which he takes up such problems, but our suspicions are aroused when we find Mr. Padmore hailed by that extremely influential and important organ of British colonial interests, *The Gold Coast Spectator,* for his "defense of the right of Africans".

From the beginning Mr. Padmore's thesis is contradictory. He condemns and repudiates any struggle for immediate demands in South Africa, asserting:

> "There is no basis for a party advocating reforms among the natives. Reformism can only thrive where reforms can be won from the employing class and government, but under South African conditions this is entirely out of the question as far as the Blacks are concerned."

This is no judgment based upon a serious analysis of present class relationships in South Africa. Were the native masses, the colored peoples, or, for that matter, the "poor white" workers and peasants to accept such a conclusion it would be tantamount to their repudiation of all struggle for the alleviation of their present conditions. In practice acceptance of such a position could only lead to passive acceptance of the status quo. In countries where the movements of the workers and the liberation struggles of oppressed peoples have reached an infinitely higher level than in South Africa, programs advancing minimum demands and social reforms have become rallying points for almost all categories of the population. Just such programs have laid the basis for defeating specific reactionary measures and restrictions of democratic rights in European countries where the struggle is already highly developed.

In a country where the great mass of the population is almost wholly without economic, political or social rights of any kind, to advocate the repudiation of struggle for immediate measures such

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the extension of the Cape franchise, abolition of the native pass system, etc., would constitute a betrayal, not a defense of Africans. Life does not present issues of struggle on the basis of "all or nothing" on all occasions. The infantile Leftist character of such an approach in this instance will soon be self-evident.

Less than a year ago the African National Congress meeting in Bloemfontaine passed a series of resolutions calling for a Native Representation Bill; the franchise to be granted to native people, as well as a demand for more land. These resolutions offer a very substantial basis for uniting native, colored and sympathetic groups among the Boers and English in a struggle for fundamentally important demands. They can become the starting point for a very broad united anti-imperialist front.

The South African trade union centers are advocating certain economic and political demands as well as organizational reforms of decisive importance within their own ranks, around which white, colored and native can be united in economic and political struggles for the defense of the day-to-day demands of all toilers. One who would in South Africa adopt the position proposed by Mr. Padmore would only succeed in isolating himself from all strata of the workers and toiling masses. British imperialism and its main allies, the Boer landlords, can welcome such a proposal with open arms.

THE WHITE DOMINATION MYTH

Regarding the contents of *How Britain Rules Africa*, the author himself informs us that his:

> ". . . chief aim is to throw light into dark places, *to discuss* the present economic, political and social conditions of the native populations, as well as the *methods* and *administrative policies adopted* by the various British colonial governments to *facilitate* the economic exploitation of the territories, and *maintain white domination over the Blacks*." (Emphasis mine—W.L.P.)

This is undoubtedly a very serious purpose. We are extremely interested in it as a whole and particularly in the last phase of it. Mr. Padmore's desire to discuss "the methods and administrative policies adopted . . . to maintain white domination over the Blacks", is of decisive importance. We are forced to believe that he consciously formulates the question of this domination as one of "white over black". We are forced to this opinion because throughout the 416 pages of his book we find him reverting to this thesis continuously, broadening it, elaborating upon it, all in the face of irrefutable facts and events, some of which he mentions, which refute

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this dangerous thesis. This thesis is the more dangerous because of its seeming plausibility as presented by Mr. Padmore.

We want to quote him in confirmation of our conclusion. This is a fundamentally important question by no means having significance only for Africa. It cannot be confined to that continent. It follows the Negro. It has a direct bearing upon the development of the Negro people's front in South Africa, America, Brazil, etc.; upon the role the Negro should play in the coming strike struggles in industrialized countries, and therefore upon the united front; upon the people's front; and upon the attitude of the Negro peoples towards the struggle for peace.

Propagation of this bourgeois thesis, together with others equally false, have led Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, a leading spokesman of the American Negro bourgeoisie, logically and inevitably to his program of "voluntary segregation". DuBois formulates his thesis thus: "The white workers are the Negro's greatest enemy." He is more crude and more honest than Mr. Padmore. Marcus Garvey has used it as an ideological weapon in his "Back to Africa", a utopian petty-bourgeois movement. Neither of these movements offers a way out for the Negro people, as Mr. Padmore himself has stated many times before.

The major problem for the oppressed and exploited peoples of the world today is the question of unity. The development of fascism everywhere raises this in its sharpest form. Let us keep this in the center of our attention. What is one of the major questions confronting a people engaged in a life and death struggle? Undoubtedly the question of allies. To a people situated as the South African native and colored peoples are, this is for them of decisive importance. They must analyze the alignment of class forces with the greatest care. They must take advantage of every breach, however slight, in the front of the forces aligned against them, to widen it and to weaken those forces. They must seek everywhere to win new forces to the struggle against the enemy even on the basis of unity around issues which do not obviously affect them, for example, support of strike struggles of white workers, no scabbing, no blacklegging of any kind. They must try to neutralize those elements which cannot, at the moment, be won. Only such a policy systematically carried out with the greatest persistency can assure hope of success in the national liberation struggles.

The white workers, the "poor whites", who constitute more than one-third of the Boer population, for whose problems capitalism has no practical solution, are the natural allies of the native and colored South Africans. British imperialism and its ally, the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Boer landlords, have directed the anger of these elements against the native and colored peoples. They rule because they have divided and pitted against each other the toiling masses: native against native, colored against native, Boer against colored and native, European against African, native and colored, the English against the field.

But the effects of the crisis have been to undermine and continue to undermine, the barriers separating one group of exploited from the other. The most profound changes in class relationship are taking place on the basis of the fall of diamond prices on the world market, and the fall of prices for agricultural products. The once more or less secure position of the white worker is becoming jeopardized by rationalization in industry and speed-up on the job.

Mr. Padmore, however, cites as an example in support of his premise of white against black the attitude of the white workers towards the natives expressed in the 1925 Resolution of the South African Trades and Labor Council:

> "The industrial policy of the labor movement is the 'civilized labor policy' which means in practice the substitution of European workers for native and colored wherever and whenever possible."

He cites the refusal of the Trade Union Coordinating Committee, of the Trade Union Congress, and the Cape Federation of Labor Unions in 1928 to the appeal of Mr. Kadalie, of the Industrial and Commercial Union, better known as the I.C.U., for unity. But 1928 is not 1936. There is nothing static about the labor movement. Conditions change; attitudes toward forces change in conformity to new interests, greater clarity, etc.

Even in 1928 the rejection of the unity appeal was not an unqualified one. It read:

> "The Committee, however, comes to the conclusion that it would be desirable if *periodical meetings* between the two organizations could be arranged or *consultations* on matters of common interest. These meetings would tend to inform both sections of their mutual difficulties and problems and *would pave the way for more formal relations in the future.*" (Emphasis mine—W.L.P.)

Mr. Padmore "misses" this, and glorifies the unqualified rejection by the I.C.U. of this compromise proposal which he terms an "impudent chauvinist memorandum". This is wrong. The I.C.U. was extremely hasty in its answer due largely to ideological weaknesses, we believe. There were mistakes on both sides. But the united front is won in struggle. It does not drop like a leaf into one's lap. It is won through struggle, much patience, much understanding of the difficulties and great ability and flexibility in taking advantage

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of changing conditions. Particularly is this true where it involves solidarity actions of members of oppressing and oppressed nations. The lessons should be carefully drawn from the past mistakes of all groups.

What can we say, however, of a man who cites 1925 and 1928 and "overlooks" the already greatly changed situation of 1936? What kind of leadership is this? What kind of aid is this in achieving the united front of "the working and middle classes, whose future, whether they realize it or not, is inseparably bound up with that of hundreds of millions of colored peoples in India, Africa, and other colonial lands"?

It becomes mere demagogy to talk of this abstract larger solidarity, this world united front and to ignore and deride concrete factors making for the creation of the united front in South Africa. There is nothing of leadership or "defense of the rights of Africans" in such an attitude. The emphasis belongs on the positive side of the question. The negative side should be exposed and constructively criticized. One should help make history as well as read it.

Today the Cape Federation includes among its members a large body of colored workers. In the Trades and Labor Council, the largest trade union center in South Africa, there are 35 affiliated unions, of which only two do not admit non-European workers to membership. The remainder of the unions affiliated to the Council have no color bar. In fact a large number of them include non-Europeans and the Council has one affiliated body composed entirely of native workers. The Council supported the principle of native territory being included in a scheme of national insurance which would provide them with medical attention. All is not as one who fights for unity would have it. But this is a far cry from 1925-28 and one who fails to acknowledge the progress made and to seriously and constructively deal with it gives objective aid to the enemy.

CLASS DIFFERENTIATIONS IN THE WHITE GROUPS

Mr. Padmore consistently fails to make any differentiation between the white ruling class and the exploited and oppressed white masses. If white and black exploited cannot win *without* each other's help, why not talk about their *common interests*? Where a distinction is made by Padmore it is for the purpose of emphasizing the "common" attitude of all whites on the question of the position of the natives. Take for example:;

> "No appeal to reason, no persuasion can wean the Boer away

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> from his color obsession; to hate the black man is as much his religion as are the dogmas of Calvin."
>
> "The relationship between white and black labor in South Africa is aggravated by the fact that white workers form an alien racial minority, who are determined to maintain their domination over the majority of the people who belong to a different race."

Domination in this sense is a question of state power. Have the white workers in South Africa state power?

Who are the dominant whites? If it were true that all white workers in South Africa accepted the bourgeois canard that they fit into this category of dominant whites, the task would be to expose the ruling class myth of white supremacy and white domination and the role that it plays in the policy of divide and rule. One should not fall into the trap of the white bourgeoisie. One only strengthens tendencies towards indiscriminate national hatred by so doing. Of course the Negro bourgeoisie does this consciously for the purpose of extending its markets among the Negro masses.

White chauvinism is fought in part by clearly exposing the true relationship of white rulers and the white oppressed masses on the basis of the concrete position of the oppressed, *i.e.*, unemployment, poor whites, strikes, wage-cuts, mass hunger, etc. It is aggravated by appealing to the national hatred of the black masses and seeking to direct this against all whites. There is no Chinese Wall between white chauvinism and national narrowness. They are the reverse sides of one and the same shield. The hatred of the oppressed Negro peoples must be turned against those who formulate, develop and nurture the idea of superior and inferior races, the pseudo-scientific theories of Anglo-Saxon superiority, Aryan superiority, Japanese superiority or any of the other racial superiorities that are propagated in order to keep one group of exploited from entering into an alliance with others for struggle against the exploiters.

But Padmore has placed the onus, the responsibility, for the Negro's desperate position, upon the exploited white masses, because white misleaders and reactionary elements within the labor movement have been able to infect it with the germ of white chauvinism. We ask him: who then is responsible for the desperateness of the plight of the poor whites? After pitting "white against black" he poses the question: What is to be done? Here the book comes to its climax. He offers the solution.

> "The united mass action of all the Africans under a popular, democratic slogan capable of drawing the *widest sections* of the *non-European workers, peasants, intellectuals and youth* into a common *anti-imperialist people's front.* This is *the immediate task* which *stands before Africans throughout the continent today.*" (My emphasis—W.L.P.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He continues:

> "In our opinion the slogan 'Africa for the Africans' is the most appropriate one under the present conditions. Furthermore, it is something that *can be easily understood* by even the most *backward black* and at the same time *it resolves* all the economic, political and social *demands* of the natives *into a national revolutionary synthesis.*" (My emphasis—W.L.P.)

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

"Black against white" can be easily understood by even the most backward black! Yes, it is a simple formula. A perfect formula for British imperialism. The reverse of the imperialist formula, the supplementing formula to "white against black". But it does not "resolve all economic, political and social demands of the natives into a national revolutionary synthesis". It is as "national revolutionary", to use Mr. Padmore's words, a formula as any yet formulated by the Nazis.

Mr. Padmore has attained his objective. The strategy of his whole campaign is revealed. The major slogan and the tactical coure are launched. Only one thing remains—forward to the salvation of British imperialism in Africa. He has marshalled the army for imperialism and the Boer landlords. It is the white workers, the poor whites, the landless Boers who are to be thrown into a bloody fratricidal war of extermination against the blacks. This is no longer only an African question. Why, we ask, is this program not good for America? American imperialism will endorse it. So too will the spokesman of the American Negro bourgeoisie, Mr. DuBois.

Let us deal with this, however, primarily from the South African angle. The anti-imperialist people's front must be created. Time is the essence of importance. *The main line for the exploited masses of South Africa, the leading idea for them, is the creation of a united anti-imperialist front of the natives, the colored people, the proletariat, white and black, and the toiling white masses against British imperialism, supported by and connected with the Boer landlords.* The struggle before us is one to shift the burden of the crisis onto the backs of the ruling class. This is the way in which we place the question in its broad aspects.

We ask Padmore: what in general are the tactics and policy of British imperialism in South Africa, in all of British Africa for that matter? It is to deepen and sharpen the belief in nationalism among all of the various peoples and to ferment and foster the hatred of one nationality against another. Its main tactical line is under guise of the solidarity of whites—white supremacy—to tie the white workers and toilers to the white ruling class. But the white workers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and toilers, the landless white peasants cannot win without the aid of their natural allies, the native and colored peoples. The reverse is equally true.

Padmore rails against the slogan of "socialism" for the whites in South Africa advanced by the Labor Party of South Africa and parallels it with a sort of "socialism" for the blacks. He forgets realities. The Boers constitute a subject race, fighting against a dominant and privileged minority. They were beaten in 1899-1902. They were beaten in the Rand strike in 1914. They were beaten because they were alone and weak. These are historical facts which we cannot ignore and from which we must draw conclusions. To recognize them does not mean to endorse the policy of the Boers toward the native peoples. To recognize them is, however, to see the Boers as an anti-imperialist force—a force against the common enemy. To ignore these facts and not to utilize them in the development of the anti-imperialist front is to weaken immeasurably that front and give objective aid to British imperialism.

SITUATION RIPE FOR UNITED STRUGGLE

The South African situation is a complex one. We have various nationalities there. The natives are not a compact homogeneous mass. They have a number of different dialects and languages. Then there are the colored peoples, the Indians, the Boers, the English and the Europeans. This is the national stage. There are great contradictions among them all. There is a great contrast between the conditions of whites and blacks. Within the working class the standard of living of the whites is many times higher than that of the blacks. They have economic and political rights denied the natives. The cultural differences between them are vast. But the struggle of the white masses against reaction, the growing trend toward fascism, and the danger of war is only assured of success when it moves along the lines of defense of the economic and political demands of the native population.

There are great possibilities for developing the united front of struggle against imperialism. A number of movements are growing. There are the growing strike struggles. A struggle has been waged by the tramway and bus workers in Fort Elizabeth since 1929. The white furniture workers average a wage of £1 a week. The building workers are unemployed most of the time. For the year they average about 3 to 6 shillings a day. White girls are getting around 14 shillings a week. The conditions for economic struggle are good.

There is a republican movement around the Boer farmers led by Malan. In the sense that it is against the natives it is reactionary.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But there are two tendencies here: One against British imperialism for a free and independent South Africa; the other to make South Africa a land in control of the reactionary Boer elements with black slaves. The progressive anti-imperialist side must be supported.

It is for those who are practical revolutionary politicians to bring the native peoples to support the first while they reject and lead the Boer masses to repudiate the second. Behind this republican movement are the broad masses of poor whites, and petty-bourgeois elements—one-third of the Boers are poor whites. In the struggle white and native will grow closer together (witness the growing unity of Negroes and whites in the Southern states of America) as a result of joint activity against the common enemy. In this joint struggle the demagogy of a Malan can be exposed.

There is the national emancipation movement of the native people. Even the native chiefs are ready to struggle for more land. Already a National Emancipation League has been formed. The I.C.U. is being revived. The influence of the African National Congress is growing. Everywhere there is renewed political activity.

A Workers and Farmers Party is being formed. The Labor Party is beginning to change its tactics toward the native peoples. The trend toward unity in the labor movement is growing and natives are being accepted into the unions of the Trade and Labor Councils, as well as the Cape Federation. A movement is developing among the unemployed; an Anti-Fascist League of 45,000, not all white, exists. Every one of these movements arises out of the worsening of the conditions of workers, farmers, poor whites or native oppressed; they are directed against imperialism.

AFRICA FOR WHOM?

How can one say a man writes in the interests of the natives who does not understand or ignores these facts? What can be said of one who, surveying this developing realignment of class forces, sees no potentialities for creating an anti-imperialist movement, who cannot see the possibilities of the united front of white and black on many specific issues, and who calls for so abstract a slogan as "Africa for the Africans"?

"Africa for the Africans." What does it mean? There are white Africans as well as black. There is an African bourgeoisie, African landlords as well as an African proletariat, toilers, farmers, etc. What Africans is Africa to be for? If, as the author states, it is only the natives or the natives and colored at the expense of the white masses, then it is a reactionary slogan. *How Britain Rules Africa* was not written in defense of Africans. If subjectively the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

writer desired to defend the oppressed African peoples the objective result is quite the contrary.

There can be no denying that the interests of the native people, who constitute the majority of the population, are paramount. To hold the masses in check British imperialism pays lip-service to this fact. The naivete with which Mr. Padmore accepts the illusions of imperialist well-meaning is indeed touching. In dealing with a forced labor order for private purposes he says very feelingly:

> "We say that this was an unfortunate document, for while we believe that Sir Donald *had no intention to sanction forced labor for private purposes*, instructions of such a character to district offices only serve to create the impression that the doctrine of 'paramountcy of native interests' *is really to be respected*." (Emphasis mine—W.L.P.)

The important point, however, is to express that interest in terms not only "which can be easily understood by the most backward native", but in terms which can be easily understood by the most backward white and accepted by him as being also in his interest. The social base of the Hertzog-Smuts-British imperialist-Boer-landlord regime must be undermined. This is our task.

As opposed to Padmore's "Africa for the Africans", the Chamber of Mines "for a White South Africa"; Malan's "Independent African Republic", we propose the slogan of an "Independent Native Republic", at the same time making it clear that there is no intention that the position of whites and blacks should be reversed. The white minority will receive full rights, the power of British imperialism will be broken and the privileges of the landlords destroyed. The cultural level of the blacks will be raised to that of the whites, not that of the whites brought down to the level of the blacks, as capitalism is today doing. This program can bring all forces now in opposition to imperialism into joint action even though around different issues.

This slogan links the national liberation struggle of the natives, which is in essence anti-imperialist, with the anti-imperialist struggle of the Boers, the Indians, British and Europeans, with the program of all anti-imperialist elements. It takes nothing from the whites, but gives equality to the blacks.

Mr. Padmore says of British imperialism and its Boer landlord allies:

> "They realize that a patchwork social organism such as theirs, *which is not even the normal capitalist system* but a hothouse plant artificially maintained by all sorts of contrivances, cannot last. . . . The crash is on the way."

This is truly profound, worthy of the best traditions of Mr. Pad-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more. But just the contrary is true. The abnormalities of the South African situation are normal for capitalism under such conditions as we have depicted. And the crash will not come of itself. To place the question as Padmore has is to lull the exploited of South Africa into a false sense of security and lead them to believe that capitalism will fall of its own rottenness. It creates passivity where it is necessary to galvanize the masses into action.

SLOGANS OF THE STRUGGLE

Action should be developed around the slogans of "bread and freedom", "equal pay for equal labor"—which must be interpreted as raising the pay up to the level of the whites, not dropping it down to the level of the blacks—"right of natives to be skilled workers", "social insurance against unemployment at the expense of the state and the employers".

On the issue of land, about which both imperialists and the oppressed masses are today talking in South Africa, we will use such slogans as "confiscation of the land of the big landlords, the land companies, and the religious missions and its distribution to the native peoples and the landless poor whites". This will not endanger the position of the small and middle farmers. On the contrary, they will keep what they have and get more.

"The abolition of the pass law system", "extension of the franchise to native and colored people", "the annulment of all restrictions which now disfranchise thousands of poor and unemployed whites". This is the way out for exploited and oppressed black and white Africa, the road to a united front of struggle against British imperialism and its allies, the Boer landlords; the road by which the burdens of the crisis will be shifted from the backs of the exploited. This is a program "firmly based upon economic realities of the relationship between financial interests and colonial policy". This is a "defense of the rights of the African".

Mr. Padmore's position on the question of "indirect rule" would rob the African peoples of the last vestige of self-government. Perhaps this is what British imperialism has placed on the order of the day and Mr. Padmore's comments are made in the nature of a trial balloon to test the strength of possible opposition. Truly Padmore has once again shown by selection and analysis of facts and events not only his bankruptcy and lack of understanding of political theory but much more clearly that his sympathies in the clash between capitalism and socialism are with the ruling class.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AFRICANS AND THE SOVIET UNION

We should like to close on a point of vital interest to the Africans. Mr. Padmore has virtually forgotten the existence of the Soviet Union. Its importance, particularly when we are dealing with the national question, the danger of war, etc., cannot be overestimated. Such "forgetfulness" should make British imperialism smile. As to how some other Britons feel on this question, just recently Mr. Leonard Barnes, a former British Colonial officer, speaking at the National Peace Conference, said: "Soviet Russia has done more effective work with the backward peoples in twelve years than Britain has done in five centuries".

The imperialist powers in the League of Nations should have been ruthlessly exposed if Mr. Padmore had written in the interests of the native peoples. Especially is this true of the point in which the question of the mandates is dealt with. How the Soviet Union aids backward peoples to govern themselves, offering them aid and support, could have been clearly brought forward by using the minor nationalities as an example. The contrast between this attitude and Britain's attitude in South Africa presents a pretty picture. The cultural and material growth of such formerly backward people as the Kazakhs, Uzbeks, Armenians, Tajiks, etc., is an epoch in the history of human relations and developments. The right of self-determination is synonymous with the term the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in the Headlines

•

FRENCH DEPUTY WRITES BOOK ON PEOPLE'S FRONT

Volume Describes Real Program and Future

NEW YORK, Sept. 1.—Maurice Thorez, member of the Chamber of Deputies representing the Seine Division, has just written a study of FRANCE TODAY AND THE PEOPLE'S FRONT for English readers. It has now been made available in a low-priced edition ($1.25) by *International Publishers.*

The book not only answers questions regarding immediate events in France, but analyzes the entire political and economic background of the country.

"This book will enable its readers to understand the real France of 1936," declares the noted British Marxist, John Strachey.

A companion volume, FRANCE FACES THE FUTURE (issued in paper covers at a special price of 25c), by the well-known English writer Ralph Fox, has also been released. It is an up-to-date survey and forecast.

SOVIET UNION IN FAVOR OF DISARMAMENT

Litvinov Outlines Peace Policy at League of Nations

NEW YORK, Sept. 1. — Litvinov's famous speeches before the League of Nations on the consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union are collected in a volume entitled THE SOVIET UNION AND THE CAUSE OF PEACE, to be released by *International Publishers* during September.

Other basic statements by Lenin, Stalin, Molotov, Voroshilov and Tukhachevsky dealing with the sincere and unswerving struggle for the maintenance of peace by the U.S.S.R. are also included in the book.

In view of the international peace congress at Brussels, this volume is of headline interest.

A two-hundred-page book, handsomely designed and printed, this collection will be issued in a low-priced paper edition for mass circulation at 30 cents a copy.

•

Order from your bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTINUE YOUR STUDY OF

MARXISM - LENINISM

In Hundreds of Books, Pamphlets, Magazines for Sale at These Bookstores and Literature Distribution Centers

Aberdeen, Wash.: 115½ West Heron St.
Akron: 365 South Main St.
Baltimore: 501A North Eutaw St.
Boston: 216 Broadway
Buffalo: 61 West Chippewa
Butte: 119 Hamilton St.
Cambridge: 6½ Holyoke St.
Camden: 304 Federal Street
Chicago: 200 West Van Buren
2135 West Division St.
1326 East 57th St.
Cincinnati: 540 Main St.
Cleveland: 1522 Prospect Ave.
Denver: 521 Exchange Bldg.
Detroit: 3537 Woodward Ave.
Duluth: 28 East First St.
Grand Rapids: 336 Bond Ave.
Hollywood: 1116 No. Lillian Way
Houston: 503 Republic Bldg.
Los Angeles: 230 South Spring St.
2411½ Brooklyn Avenue
321 West 2nd St.
Madison, Wisc.: 312 W. Gorham
Milwaukee: 419 West State St.
Minneapolis: 241 Marquette Ave.
Newark: 33 Halsey St.
New Haven: 17 Broad St.
New York: 50 East 13th St.
140 Second Ave.
218 East 84th St.
115 W. 135th St., Harlem
1001 Prospect Ave., Bronx
2067 Jerome Ave., Bronx
369 Sutter Ave., Brooklyn
Brighton Beach Boardwalk at 6th Street
44-17 Queens Blvd., Sunnyside, L. I.
4531 16th Ave., Brooklyn
Omaha: 311 Karbach Block
Oakland: 419 12th Street
Paterson: 201 Market St.
Philadelphia: 104 So. 9th St.
118 W. Allegheny Ave.
4023 Girard Ave.
2404 Ridge Ave.
Pittsburgh: 607 Bigelow Blvd.
Portland, Ore.: 314 S. W. Madison St.
Providence: 335 Westminster St., Room 42
Racine: 205 State Street
Reading: 224 North Ninth Street
Richmond, Va.: 205 N. 2nd St.
Sacramento: 1024 Sixth St.
St. Louis: 3520 Franklin Ave.
St. Paul: 600 Wabasha St.
Salt Lake City: 134 Regent St.
San Diego: 635 E St.
San Francisco:
170 Golden Gate Ave.
1609 O'Farrell St.
121 Haight St.
San Pedro: 244 W. Sixth St.
Santa Barbara:
208 W. Canon Perdido
Schenectady: 204 Nott Terrace
Seattle: 713½ Pine St.
Spokane: West 9 Riverside
Superior: 601 Tower Ave.
Tacoma: 1315 Tacoma Ave.
Toledo: 214 Michigan
Washington, D.C.: 513 F St., N.W.
Youngstown:
310 W. Federal St., 3d Fl.

●

Write for a complete catalog to any of the above addresses or to

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D — New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED